



HANDBOOK

FOR

LIBERAL SPEAKERS

**Provincial
Campaign
1907**

RBC
JL
299
.L4
LIB
1907



THE GOVERNMENT'S RAILWAY RECORD

When the last Liberal Government of Manitoba went out of office in January, 1900, there were three railway systems, the C.P.R., the Northern Pacific, and the Canadian Northern, serving the Province. The Canadian Northern was operating a considerable mileage and was at work building its line between Winnipeg and Port Arthur.

Had the railway situation in Manitoba continued as it then was, the Province would to-day have three railway systems competing to serve it, and the fight for trade would probably have brought the rates down all over the Province to less than what they are. Moreover, there would not have been the acute grain and freight blockades which in recent years have cost the country so heavily.

Proposal to Introduce Fourth Competing System.

Soon after taking office Mr. Hugh John Macdonald, signed a contract with J. P. McDonald, of New York, for a fourth competing railway, with an outlet to Duluth. This contract with one of the leading railway builders of the United States was all ready to be submitted to the Legislature for ratification, when Mr. Roblin replaced Mr. Macdonald,

Nothing was known by the public of the J. P. McDonald contract until March, 1901, when Mr. McDonald, in a letter addressed to Mr. Greenway, which the latter read in the Legislature, enclosed a copy of the contract. It provided for a line to Duluth and for between three and four hundred miles of railway in Manitoba, the Province to guarantee the interest on \$10,000 per mile on the mileage in Manitoba, and on \$15,000 per mile on the Minnesota mileage, in return for which 51 per cent of the stock was to be deposited with the Railway Commissioner of Manitoba, the Province was to appoint the controller and auditor of the company, and there were to be specific freight rate reductions, the grain rate being fixed at 10 cents, with passenger rates not to exceed 2½ cents per mile between stations in Manitoba. A penalty of \$10,000 was provided for each and every violation by the company of the agreement as to rates.

Competing Systems Reduced From Three to Two.

This contract was thrown overboard by Mr. Roblin when he and Mr. Rogers stepped into the Government, Mr. Hugh

John Macdonald passing out. Mr. Roblin and Mr. Rogers lost no time in getting busy. The Conservative party had gone to the country in 1890 with the Government Ownership cry. The Roblin-Rogers Government made an agreement with the Northern Pacific, dated January 1, 1901, by which the Province took over the Northern Pacific mileage in Manitoba for 999 years, at an annual rental of \$210,000 for the first ten years, \$225,000 for the second ten years, \$275,000 for the third ten years, and \$300,000 per year for the remainder of the continuance of the lease, and the Province was given the option of purchasing the system at the price of \$7,000,000.

By virtue of another agreement dated February 11, 1901, the Government transferred to the Canadian Northern Railway company the above lease and option with all the rights and powers therein contained. Thus were the Government Ownership pre-election pledges of the Conservative party fulfilled.

Bonds on the Port Arthur Line Guaranteed.

By this last mentioned agreement the Government also agreed to guarantee the bonds of the Ontario and Rainy River section of the Canadian Northern railway to the extent of \$20,000 per mile for 290 miles. This section had been already assisted by the Dominion Government to the extent of \$6,400 per mile and by the Ontario Government to the extent of \$4,000 per mile.

The Alleged "Control of Rates."

The following is Clause 8 of the contract in regard to the alleged "control of rates" by the Government:

"In consideration of the guarantee of the said bonds and the assignment of said lease and option, the company hereby agrees that up to the 30th day of June, A.D. 1930, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council shall, from time to time, fix the rates to be charged or demanded by the company for the carriage of all freights from all points on the company's lines in Manitoba to Port Arthur, and from Port Arthur to all points on the company's lines in Manitoba, and from all points on the company's lines in Manitoba to all other points on said lines in Manitoba. Provided always that, before any rates are so fixed, the company shall be heard and their interests taken into consideration. The company agrees that it will not at any time after the said rates have been so fixed, charge or demand for the carriage of freight between the points aforesaid, greater rates than those so fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council."

Provision is made that, in the event of a reduction of more than four cents per hundred on grain, or more than 15 per cent. on the carriage of all other freight to and from Manitoba, to and from Fort William and Port Arthur, the Government shall pay the deficiency, if any, payable by the company (after payment of working expenses) in respect of interest and rentals. In that event the Government pays the deficiency and the company ceases to be liable.

Rates Reduced 10c per 100 lbs During Greenway Regime.

Rates on wheat from Manitoba to the lake ports were 14c per hundred pounds on the basis of Winnipeg, meaning proportionately higher rates from points west of Winnipeg when Mr. Roblin took office. During the Liberal period rates had fallen from 24c per 100 lbs to 14c per hundred pounds—a reduction of 10c per 100 lbs or 6c a bushel.

Canadian Northern Reduces Rates 2c.

The Canadian Northern upon the opening of its line from Winnipeg to Port Arthur in 1902 reduced the grain rates 2c per hundred pounds, making the rate 12c per 100 lbs on the basis of Winnipeg.

Another Cut of 2c Promised by Roblin.

On July 16, 1903, four days before the last Provincial general elections, the Roblin Government sprang upon the public the announcement that an Order-in-Council had been passed commanding the Canadian Northern to reduce its freight rates on wheat by two cents per 100 lbs. In making this announcement, the Government newspaper printed across the entire front of its first pages in its largest type: "Ten Cent Rate Fixed by Government. Order-in-Council Passed Cutting Another Two Cents Off Rate on Wheat. To Go into Effect September 1. Government Redeems Its Promise to Make Reduction Before Moving of This Year's Crop." The remaining days of the campaign were filled with a prodigious clamor about this promised ten cent rate to come into effect on the Canadian Northern on September 1.

The Rate Comes Down and Goes Up.

The pledge thus given to the electors on the eve of the elections in 1903 has not been carried out. The Order-in-Council published on July 16 of that year was a campaign device. On September 1, 1903, the Canadian Northern put into temporary operation the reduced rates set forth in the Order-in-Council. And a few weeks later, on October 6, 1903, the wheat rates on the Canadian Northern were advanced to 11 cents per 100 lbs, from points immediately west of Winnipeg, with, of course, proportionately higher rates elsewhere throughout the Province.

If, in his pre-election promises to reduce the freight rate to ten cents, Mr. Roblin had been content to pledge only his own word, it would not have been so bad. But realizing how heavily his pledges are discounted by the public, he resorted to the device of using his position as the adviser of the representative of the Crown to have his campaign trump card in the shape of an Order-in-Council. He knew that unless he thus dragged the Crown into the game he was playing, his bluffing would not fool the public. The issuing of that stage-play Order-in-Council was a discreditable campaign trick.

The freight rate situation as it is to-day shows up Mr. Roblin's vaunted "control" as being no more real than that of the fly on the wheel.

Mr. Roblin in his speech at the Gagey celebration in Toronto, talked about the Canadian Northern having "the smallest bonded indebtedness, and therefore the smallest fixed charges of any railroad of similar length in the civilized world." (Toronto Mail and Empire, August 13, 1903.) He laid great stress on this as showing that the Canadian Northern had less to earn than other roads, and so the rates could be kept down. How, then, can he justify his allowing the Canadian Northern—if he has "control" as he claims to have—to charge the same rates as the C.P.R.? Where does the advantage to the Province from the "smallest bonded indebtedness and therefore the smallest fixed charge" come in?

Why Not a Ten Cent Rate?

If the Roblin Government's control is real, why is not the ten cent rate in force? Mr. Roblin told the people of Manitoba, when he issued that ten cent Order-in-Council on the eve of the last Provincial general elections, that there was no risk of a deficit until the nine cent rate was reached, and that the Canadian Northern could do business profitably on the ten cent rate. Eleven cents, with proportionately higher rates for outside points, is the Canadian Northern rate to-day. So much for Mr. Roblin's "control" over the Canadian Northern.

Only 3c Reduction as Against 10c Under Greenway.

To recapitulate. The freight rates on wheat when the Greenway Government took office were on the basis of 24 cents per 100 lbs from Winnipeg to Port Arthur. They were down to a 14 cent basis when the Greenway Government left office. The Canadian Northern, as a result of the deal with the Roblin Government, made a reduction of 2 cents per 100 lbs. Then in July, 1903, for election purposes, came the Order-in-Council that there should be a further reduction of 2 cents from all points on the Canadian Northern. This reduction went into operation for five weeks, when it went out of operation, and in its place there was established the present rate of 11 cents per 100 lbs from Winnipeg and all points west of Winnipeg, with a 10 cent rate from Winnipeg and points east. But Winnipeg and points east are not points of origin for wheat shipments. The 10 cent rate is thus merely nominal, a straw rate, a thing of naught. The actual reduction in the wheat rate since the Greenway Government left office is 3 cents. When he launched his Order-in-Council for election purposes in 1903 he proclaimed that he had secured for the farmers of Manitoba a reduction of 4 cents. If his control is real, why are Canadian Northern rates only 3 cents less than when he became Premier?

No Control Over the Operation of the C. N. R.

That in the matter of operation the Canadian Northern is not in any manner, shape or form under the control of the Roblin Government, any more than it is in the matter of rates, has

been demonstrated conclusively by the events of the winter of 1900-7. And yet Clause 13 of the contract reads as follows:

"The Company shall provide and maintain such equipment for its lines of railway as will reasonably provide for the requirements of the freight and passenger traffic of said lines, and should any dispute arise under this clause the same shall be decided by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council of Canada."

Mr. Roblin, in his speech in the Legislature on March 6, 1901, in moving the second reading of the bill to confirm the deal made with the Canadian Northern, said:

"A plank in our party was Government Ownership—in so far as it was practicable and desirable. . . .

"In the bill before the House we have all the practical benefits of Government Ownership. . . .

"We have escaped all the dangers of Government Ownership, and secured all that is practically beneficial and desirable."

The test of these declarations has come this winter, and all the Province knows now that, with the Roblin Government in power, these declarations mean nothing. The Roblin Government has not stirred a finger to put Clause 13 of the Canadian Northern contract in operation. In an interview published in the Montreal Star of October 30, 1903, Mr. Roblin said: "I am glad to say that for the first time in my 'twenty-six years' experience in Manitoba, there is no suggestion that could be made to either of the railway companies that would improve the conditions. I can say without egotism, that this pleasing result is due to the railway policy of the Provincial Government of which I am the Premier." In that fool's paradise the Roblin Government continued until the rude shock of the facts dispelled the illusion. But even then the Government did nothing.

Clause 13 provides that in the event of any dispute arising between the Government and the Canadian Northern over the inadequacy of equipment and operation, the matter should be taken before the Railway Commission, which has taken the place of the old Railway Committee at Ottawa, and upon the Commission deciding that the equipment and operation were inadequate, it would rest with the Provincial Government to compel the Canadian Northern to live up to the obligations of its contract just as strictly as the Canadian Northern compels the guaranteeing of \$10,000 by the Province for every mile of new track.

Mr. Roblin Pleads That He is Powerless.

But the Roblin Government has given no sign of being aware of the existence of Clause 13. The same Mr. Roblin who in March, 1901, pointed to Clause 13 and said "We have all the practical benefits of Government Ownership," on January 8, 1907, on the floor of the Legislature, in reply to Mr. Mickle's demand that the Government should make good these words, said: "We cannot control a Dominion chartered railway."

In the Legislature on February 5, 1907, Mr. Prefontaine gave vigorous expression to the need of protection being afforded to farmers along the Canadian Northern, where there are no fences, and people are losing cattle and have trouble in getting redress. Mr. Colin H. Campbell replied that "the Province has no control," and Mr. Roblin emphasized the Attorney-General's statement, and remarked that "some people and some newspapers could not understand the matter, but persist in saying that the C. N. R. is a Government-Owned and Government-Controlled railway."

"The fact was," he said, "that the Government had no more control over the C.N.R. in its general operations than over the C.P.R.; the only interest and control it had was in the matter of freight rates." That is to say, as has been shown, the interest and control of the fly on the wheel.

What the Province Has Done for the C.N.R.

What has the Province done for this railway system over which it has no control?

It has guaranteed bonds, already disposed of by the Railway Company, to the amount of \$15,492,092 (Public accounts, 1907, page 281.)

It has pledged itself further to guarantee similar bonds to the value of \$5,323,494.

It is the security for the rentals of the Northern Pacific and Manitoba lines to the Northern Pacific involving a contingent liability of \$7,000,000.

The Greenway Guarantees.

The Greenway Government inaugurated the policy of assisting the Canadian Northern to build lines by guaranteeing its bonds. It gave guarantees to the extent of \$8,000 a mile on these sections of its road:

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| Gladstone to Winnipegosis, 125 | |
| miles | \$1,000,000 |
| Winnipeg Southeastern, 108 | |
| miles | 864,000 |
| Dauphin to Grandview, 27 | |
| miles | 216,000 |
| Sifton Junction to Erwood | |
| 177 miles | 1,416,000 |
| Minnesota section | 349,000 |

Total \$3,845,000

The last item, the Minnesota section, was assisted by Provincial debentures not by guaranteed bonds; but as the railway pays the interest and provides for the principal under penalty of mortgage foreclosure these bonds may fairly be classed with those which are simply guaranteed.

Roblin Increased Guarantees by Seventeen Millions.

The Greenway Government therefore pledged the Province's credit, in aid of the Canadian Northern, to the extent of \$3,845,000. Under the Roblin Government the aggregate amount of guarantees has grown to \$20,815,586. Since 1901, there has not been a session of the Legislature which has not authorized

new guarantees. In the session of 1907 the guaranteeing of bonds to the value of \$1,150,000 was authorized.

\$2,000 a Mile for Equipment.

The Roblin Government raised the amount of the guarantee from \$8,000 a mile to \$10,000 a mile, and gave guarantees for an extra \$2,000 a mile upon the mileage already guaranteed on the lower rate by the Greenway Government. This extra \$2,000 a mile was alleged to be for "equipment."

The List of Guarantees.

The subjoined table shows the full amount of the Province's guarantees to date:

| | Miles. | Rate. |
|---|--------|--------------|
| 1. Gladstone to W'p'gosis... | 125 | \$ 8,000 |
| 2. Winnipeg southeast to boundary... | 108 | 8,000 |
| 3. Sifton Junction to Erwood | 177 | 8,000 |
| 4. Dauphin to Grandview.... | 27 | 8,000 |
| 5. (a) Carman Junction to Carman.. | 70 | |
| (b) Neepawa Junction, via Carberry Jct. through Neepawa.... | 53 | |
| (c) Rossburn extension to Clanwilliam.... | 20 | |
| (d) Beaver to Gladstone.... | 18-161 | 8,000 |
| 6. Winnipeg to Oak Point.. | 55 | |
| (for part).... | | 8,000 |
| (for balance).... | | 5,000 |
| 7. Lines included in Nos. 1 to 5.... | .. | 2,000 |
| Lines included in Nos. 6.. | .. | 5,000 |
| 8. Clanwilliam, northwesterly.... | 80 | |
| Emerson, easterly.. | 20 | |
| McCreary Junction, southerly.... | 18 | |
| Hartney to Virden branch.... | 40 | |
| Roland to Morden branch.... | 20 | |
| P. la P. to Carberry... | 40 | |
| Greenway extension.... | 40 | |
| Minto to Melita..... | 30 | |
| Thunder Hill branch.. | 20 | |
| Fairfax branch.... | 15 | |
| C'b'y Jct. to Carberry | 20-343 | 10,000 |
| 9. Carberry, west to boundary.... | 100. | 10,000 |
| 10. Winnipeg east.... | 25 | 10,000 |
| 11. From above line to Bird's Hill.... | 7 | 10,000 |
| 12. St. Charles' Cut off to Somerset.... | 7 | 10,000 |
| 13. Emerson Sprague cut off. | 50 | 10,000 |
| 14. New branch to Deloraine. | 35 | 10,000 |
| 15. Oakland, northwesterly.... | 50 | 10,000 |
| 16. Oak Point, northwesterly. | 25 | 10,000 |
| 17. Hallboro, westerly.. | 80 | 10,000 |
| 18. Virden, northwesterly..... | 20 | 10,000 |
| 19. Bird's Hill, northeasterly. | 15 | 10,000 |
| | 1,407 | |
| 1,407 miles at \$10,000..... | | \$14,070,000 |
| Winnipeg terminals.... | | 1,000,000 |
| Line to Port Arthur.... | | 5,745,536 |

Total contingent liability..\$20,815,536

To this can be added the contingent liability of seven million dollars which the Province has assumed in connection with the lease of the old Northern Pacific and Manitoba lines. The Province is liable for this amount to the Northern Pacific; and in turn the Canadian Northern is liable to the Province.

**Total Contingent Liabilities of
\$27,000,000.**

Thus the credit of the Province has been pledged on behalf of the Cana-

dian Northern to the enormous extent of \$27,815,586. Yet the Province has nothing to say, according to Mr. Roblin, should the road fail to operate its lines.

The entire amount of \$20,815,586 worth of guaranteed bonds authorized by the Manitoba Legislature has not yet been taken up. According to the Public Accounts of 1906 the actual amount of guarantees issued up to Dec. 31, 1906 was as follows:

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| Line to Port Arthur.. | \$ 5,745,586 |
| Manitoba lines | 9,746,506 |

\$15,492,092

The remaining five millions of guarantees are however authorized and the Province must deliver them when the Railway Company builds the lines for which they are granted.

Roblin Claims Guarantees Must Continue.

Nor is there any prospect that this wholesale guaranteeing of bonds will ever end while the Roblin Government remains in power. Mr. Roblin speaking in the Legislature on Jan. 7, 1907, in reply to Mr. C. J. Mickle said:

"I want to point out to him a fact, re said to the Canadian Northern Railway, and if he does not already know it as he ought to know, being a lawyer, I am going to tell him now that under the operation of the contract and agreement made in 1901, the Canadian Northern Railway cannot build a line of railway, in this Province, whether the bonds are guaranteed or not, unless in the operation of the agreement the mortgage can cover it. It is essential that we go on with the construction of these lines; but my hon. friend says: No, you shall not build these lines in this country, and yet, to repeat, if the railway does build a line, they cannot raise one dollar only on the second bonds. Therefore the line of demarcation between the party the hon. gentleman represents and the party I represent, is that while they would put an end to this construction of railways, we will continue to put out these lines until we give the people in all parts of the province the lines they want."

A Delightful Prospect.

This means that, as Mr. Roblin interprets the contract between the Canadian Northern Railway and the Province, the railway will never build a mile of railway in this Province unless its bonds are guaranteed by the Province. Mr. Roblin contends practically that the Province has no alternative, but to keep on guaranteeing these bonds during the continuance of the mortgage. A delightful prospect truly!

The Results in a Nutshell.

To sum up:

Mr. Roblin found the Province with three competing railway systems.

He reduced the number to two.

He has involved the Province in a contingent liability of over twenty millions of dollars in order to secure

"control of rates" over the Canadian Northern.

As a result of this "control" wheat rates have been reduced 3c per 100 lbs. during his seven years of office, while they fell 10c per 100 lbs. during the previous Liberal regime of 12 years.

The Province is bound under the contract made by the Province, as interpreted by himself, to continue to guarantee bonds for every mile of railway built by the Canadian Northern during the life of the 999-year contract.

The Province, according to Mr. Roblin, has nothing to say as to how the road is operated, or whether it is operated at all. "We have no control over it during the life of the mortgage.

THE FINANCIAL RECORD

In dealing with the present financial position of the Province and the record of the Roblin Government as the custodian of the treasury it is essential that attention be paid to the important matter of the comparative receipts of this and the preceding Government. Much is heard from the Government of its successful administration of the Province's finances and the possession of \$812,000 in cash is acclaimed as a marvellous achievement in economy; but the public is not informed that the Government has been the fortunate recipient during its seven years of office of revenues over and above those received by the Greenway during its last seven-year period (1893 to 1899) amounting to more than Five Million Dollars. Appended are tables showing total receipts of the Province for these two periods:

Total receipts, 1893-1899.

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| Subsidy | \$3,453,454.13 |
| Int. School Lands Funds | 104,070.55 |
| Fines | 29,223.04 |
| Fees | 17,609.33 |
| County Court Fees | 52,853.41 |
| Law Fees | 58,767.05 |
| Land Titles Fees | 337,039.65 |
| Marriage Licenses | 9,573.00 |
| Manitoba Gazette | 18,535.77 |
| Sale of Statutes | 1,732.91 |
| 3 per cent. Gross Earnings | 41,138.70 |
| Liquor Licenses | 182,716.60 |
| Interest | 239,574.26 |
| Private Bills | 6,302.70 |
| Refunds | 19,703.24 |
| Provincial Lands | 92,524.98 |
| Support of Insane | 227,578.05 |
| " " Incurables | 3,374.41 |
| " " Deaf and Dumb | 2,195.00 |
| Succession Duties | 5,213.98 |
| Insurance Act Fees | 67,653.00 |
| Sundry Revenues | 42,405.12 |

Grand Total \$5,011,278.50

Total receipts, 1900-06.

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Subsidy | \$3,818,788.54 |
| Int. School Lands Fund... | 608,901.48 |
| Fines | 81,315.60 |
| Fees | 101,192.04 |
| County Court Fees | 76,954.96 |
| Law Stamps and Law Fees | 72,504.22 |
| Land Titles, General Fees.. | 046,452.57 |
| Marriage Licenses | 21,257.28 |
| Manitoba Gazette | 31,174.40 |
| Sale of Statutes | 3,007.20 |
| 3 per cent. Gross Earnings | 45,050.75 |
| Liquor Licenses | 345,010.81 |
| Interest | 368,402.95 |
| Private Bills | 16,743.20 |
| Provincial Lands | 2,000,540.03 |
| Support of Incurables | 13,459.85 |
| " " Lunatics | 440,122.60 |
| " " Deaf and Dumb | 54,804.05 |
| Insurance Act Fees | 108,970.00 |
| Succession Duty | 158,642.09 |
| Municipal Tax | 62,048.89 |
| Corporation Tax | 305,049.15 |
| Railway Tax | 821,401.05 |
| Sundry Revenue | 53,120.16 |
| Land Titles Assce. Fund.. | 72,000.00 |
| Fire Prevention | 5,749.81 |
| Refunds | 804.97 |

Grand Total.. ...\$10,146,677.06

The comparison works out as follows:

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| Total Receipts, Roblin | |
| period | \$10,146,677.06 |
| Total Receipts, Liberal | |
| period | 5,011,278.50 |

Excess Roblin period over

Greenway period \$5,135,398.56

Out of this extra five millions the Roblin Government claim to have saved \$812,760. This is the net result of their seven years' administration on their own showing; and it does not seem such a wonderful achievement after all when all the facts are taken into account.

Increases in Receipts Not Due to Roblin.

It may be claimed that the Roblin Government is entitled to credit for the enlarged receipts. Look over the two sets of figures and pick out the increases that can be credited to the fact that the Roblin Government is in office; they are few and far between.

The extra \$363,334 received from Ottawa for subsidy resulted automatically from the increase in population.

The receipts from the school lands fund, which is administered by the Dominion Government, show an increase of \$556,788.

Thus the Province got from the Ottawa Government during the last five years extra revenue to the extent of \$920,122—which is \$108,000 more than the cash savings of the period.

The Roblin Government got over one million dollars from the Land Titles fees, including the ordinary fees and the assurance fund fees, while the Liberal Government in a corresponding period got only \$337,039. Here is excess revenue to the extent of \$681,413, for which no measure of credit attaches to the Roblin Government. This resulted entirely from the activity in

real estate which in turn was the offset of the influx of people into Western Canada.

The growth and expansion of the country, which would have proceeded along its normal lines had Mr. Roblin never existed, explains most of the smaller increases such as \$173,513 fees and receipts from the courts, \$153,000 from succession duties, and \$41,000 from Insurance Act fees.

Two Millions From Provincial Lands.

The receipts from Provincial lands are worthy of special attention. From 1893 to 1899 the Province received all told \$92,524 from its lands; while for the Roblin Government period the receipts have been:

| | |
|-----------|-----------|
| 1900..... | \$ 62,570 |
| 1901..... | 120,566 |
| 1902..... | 256,916 |
| 1903..... | 292,742 |
| 1904..... | 277,202 |
| 1905..... | 446,752 |
| 1906..... | 543,788 |

Total.... \$2,000,540

This immense amount of money was obtained by selling off the Provincial landed estate—disposing of capital that is to say.

In one sense perhaps the Roblin Government can claim credit for these enlarged receipts from land. They can say that if they had not shown such zeal in disposing of the land, selling it in large blocks to speculators, the cash receipts would have been smaller. But in that case the Province would have still had the land.

60 Per Cent. of the Province's Lands Sold.

The Roblin Government inherited from its predecessors 1,865,945 acres of land and it has received during its term of office 276,000 acres from the Dominion Government. It has thus had a landed estate of 2,141,945 acres to administer. How much of this estate is left? Just 898,682 acres, according to the table of assets given by the Provincial Treasurer in his budget speech (Jan. 16, 1907). The Roblin Government has sold no less than 1,243,263 acres of land or 58 per cent. of all the land the Province had title to.

The excess of land receipts in favor of the Roblin Government amounts to \$1,908,000—or over a million dollars more than the cash savings of \$812,760 about which such a chorus of commendations has ascended.

Items to be Credited to Roblin.

Some of these items of increased receipts are Mr. Roblin's work and he should be credited with them.

One is the extra \$162,284 from liquor licenses.

To this should be added the corporation tax, \$305,049, and the railway tax, \$321,491, which were first imposed by the present Government. The railway tax is however imposed to the injury of the municipalities, as they are now forbidden to impose taxation on the railways.

Part of the Cash is Borrowed Money.

The \$812,700 cash on hand does not in its entirety represent savings from receipts. It includes no less than \$252,000 of borrowed money. In 1900 the Province issued a loan of \$500,000, ostensibly to pay the Greenway deficit. As the Greenway deficit according to the report of the Financial Commissioner (sessional papers 1900, page 427) amounted only to \$248,000 there remained a balance of \$252,000 in cash, which is part of the existing cash in the banks subject to the cheque of the Provincial Treasurer.

Cash Surplus Only \$560,000.

Thus the actual surplus after seven years of administration to be credited to the Roblin Government is \$812,000 cash in the bank less \$252,000 borrowed money, or \$560,000.

The Roblin Government got extra revenue to the extent of \$5,135,398 and out of this they spent \$4,575,398 and saved \$560,000.

Where Did the Extra Money Go?

What did the Roblin Government do with the additional \$4,575,398 which it received?

Capital Outlay on Buildings.

The Provincial Treasurer in his budget speech claimed that \$919,086 had gone in extraordinary expenditures and in the erection of public buildings. If this is conceded there yet remains \$3,656,312 to account for. What happened to it? It has gone in enlarged expenditures. Admitting that the increase in population means a relative increase in the cost of administering the Government is not an increased ordinary expenditure of \$3,656,312 in seven years, or more than half a million dollars a year excessive?

Grants to the People Less Proportionately.

The contention is made that more generous grants to the people account for much of this expenditure. The grants to the people under the Roblin Government have however been less generous in proportion than those of their predecessors.

There is much room for debate as to what really constitutes grants to the people, but for purposes of comparison the classification adopted by Mr. Agnew in his 1907 budget speech can be accepted. Mr. Agnew quoted figures showing that from 1895 to 1899 the Liberals gave \$1,188,946 in grants to the people, while the Roblin Government from 1902 to 1906, gave \$2,231,792. By using the same classification and extending the figures to the seven years period it is found.

From 1893 to 1899 the Liberals out of a total revenue of \$5,011,278.50 gave \$1,529,450 in grants to the people or 30 per cent.

From 1900 to 1906 the Roblin Government out of a total revenue of \$10,146,677 gave \$2,687,756 in grants to the people or 26 per cent.

Educational Grants Contrasted.

Take education, a matter of vital importance, the Liberals from 1893 to 1899 gave \$1,002,065 to education or 21½ per cent. of the total revenue. Out of every \$100 they received they gave \$21.50 to education.

The Roblin Government during its seven years of office gave \$1,717,643 to education or only 17 per cent.

Still 2½ Millions to Account For.

Let us look at this matter of the \$3,656,312 of extra expenditure which we are trying to account for in the light of these grants to the people. The extra grants by the Roblin Government, on the basis of Mr. Agnew's classification, amount to \$1,158,306. Subtract this and we still have \$2,498,006 of extra expenditure to account for.

It didn't go for buildings for they are provided for; nor for grants to the people. How then was it spent?

This sum of two and a half million dollars represents the extra amount that it cost to "run the machine" in the seven years of Roblin rule. It is what the Province has paid for the extravagant and wasteful methods of the present administration.

Summary.

To recapitulate:

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Roblin's Excess Revenue for | |
| 7 years | \$5,135,398 |
| Spent thus: | |
| Buildings, etc. | \$ 919,086 |
| Extra grants to | |
| people | 1,158,306 |
| Cash.. .. | 560,000 |
| | <hr/> 2,637,392 |

Extra cost of "Running Machine"\$2,498,006

The cash \$560,000 plus the \$252,000 of borrowed money represents the \$812,000 cash in the bank.

Such is the financial record of the Roblin Government.

QUESTIONABLE LAND TRANSACTIONS

The recklessness with which the present Government has administered the lands of the Province is established by a reference to the records. When the Conservatives came into power in 1900, the Province owned 1,872,000 acres (report of Financial Commission Sessional pages, 1900. Page 426.)

From that time until Dec. 31, 1905, (the latest date to which the published departmental reports bring the record) the Province received 276,000 acres from the Dominion, thus increasing the aggregate land holdings of the Province to 2,148,803 acres.

Hon. Mr. Agnew, in his budget speech, delivered Jan. 16, 1907, gave the present land holdings of the Province at 898,682 acres. The Roblin Government has, therefore, during its term of office disposed of 1,250,121 acres.

The Greenway Government, during its whole term of office, sold only 77,579 acres of land, at an average price of \$3.15 per acre. This land was practically all recovered swamp land, and the

high average price obtained for it shows that it was well managed and was sold skillfully. The Roblin Government, despite the great increase in land values during the last five years, and the further important fact that its sales include 420,000 acres of high class arable prairie lands picked from the M. & N. W. railway land grant, has averaged only \$2.92 an acre for the land sold by it.

The Dyck Transaction.

The transaction by which Mr. J. D. Dyck became, in May, 1902, the nominal owner for a brief period of time of 20,392 acres of M. & N.W. lands was a peculiar one. From the return brought down in the Legislature in 1906, it appears that a deposit of some \$6,000 was made on April 30, 1902, on account of this land, and a receipt was issued on May 13. The first peculiarity apparent in connection with this sale is that it was sold for less than the current price of lands at that time.

The average purchase price of the M. & N.W. lands for the whole of the year 1901, as set forth in the official report of the Provincial Lands Commissioner, to be found in the Sessional papers, 1902, page 468, was \$3.10 per acre. The same report states that on November 1, 1901, the price of the M. & N. W. lands was made \$3.50 per acre. On April 1, 1902, a further advance of 50 cents per acre was made, making the price \$4 per acre; yet on May 13, this Dyck sale was put through at \$3 per acre.

The Government has never explained why it sold the Dyck land for \$1 per acre less than the prices fixed by the department and exacted for adjoining land of similar quality.

It cannot be claimed in explanation that Mr. Dyck was given his land at \$1.00 less than the market price because he had an option dating from the period when the lands were held at \$3 per acre: because Mr. Roblin declared in the session of 1906 that the Lands Department had never given option, and this was confirmed by L. J. Howe, chief clerk of the department, in his evidence before the Public Accounts Committee, during the same session.

The land nominally purchased by Mr. Dyck includes five sections in township 37, range 19 W. of the 2nd meridian; eleven sections in township 37, range 17; and sixteen sections in township 38, range 21. Early in April, 1902, the alternate sections in townships 36 and 38, range 20, township 37, range 21, and township 38, range 22, comprising in all 40,000 acres, were sold by the Provincial Government to a Toronto firm at \$4 per acre. This land adjoins that included in the Dyck transaction and is of identical quality.

Mr. Dyck, although down upon the books of the department as the purchaser, had never visited the district where the land is located; and he had never applied either personally or by letter to the land department of the Government, asking that this land be sold him. Moreover, he never paid a cent to the Government, excepting with respect to one section of land, referred to below. The Government sold this immense block of land to a man

who was, so far as they know, merely a name, at the request of certain parties whose names do not appear at all in the return brought down to the Legislature.

Mr. Dyck is a well-to-do German farmer, of Winkler. As a matter of fact, he did not purchase 20,302 acres of land, although he is down on the books of the department as having bought that amount. The actual amount of land which he bought was only one section, and this he paid for at the rate of \$3 per acre, and his name was simply used by other parties for the other 19,700 acres, which are shown on the department's books as having been sold to him. All this land was quit-claimed by him to other parties, and his interest in it was short-lived and was purely technical.

The return brought down by the Government does not contain the names of any of the members of the syndicate which really purchased this land and secured it from Mr. Dyck by quit-claim, afterwards selling it to various parties at advanced prices, making an extremely handsome profit in the transaction.

The Ridd-Gerrie Deal.

On June 20, 1904, the Department of Provincial Lands transferred 6,841 acres in township 17, range 11 east, to Robert Ridd, furnaceman in the old court house in this city, earning \$7 a week, at \$2.40 per acre. The cash paid down by Ridd, as shown by the official record, was \$1,633.85.

In defending the price at which the land in question was transferred from public ownership to private ownership, Mr. Roblin, speaking in the Legislature on Jan. 31, 1906, said that it was the price fixed by an inspector of the Provincial Government, J. F. Choate by name. This J. F. Choate made his inspection and fixed the price at \$2.40 per acre in 1901. The land was thus sold to Robert Ridd at a valuation three years old—though between 1901 and 1904 land in Western Canada doubled, and in many cases trebled and even quadrupled, in value.

On July 27, five weeks after the sale to Ridd by the Roblin Government, Ridd transferred the 6,841 acres to Chas. Gerrie, caretaker of the old court house (salary \$720 a year). But nine days before the transfer, on July 18, Gerrie sold the 6,841 acres for \$68,412.75. Of this amount there has been paid since then between \$20,000 and \$25,000, most of this being cash down. It was not paid to Gerrie, but to a lawyer representing Gerrie and the persons behind him.

The tract of land in question is described in a prospectus issued by the Anglia Land, Lumber and Townsite Company—a concern which was to have taken over all but four hundred acres of it—as being heavily covered with valuable timber, the soil being black, sandy loam of good depth with white clay subsoil. The prospectus quoted at length from the reports of the Government inspectors and bush rangers and estimated the

value of the tract (exclusive of the lots in the township and of the four hundred acres reserved by the purchasers from Gerrle "contiguous to one of the greatest water powers on the river") at \$209,320. An important element in the value of the 6,841 acres secretly disposed of by the Roblin Government via Caretaker Gerrle and Furnaceinan Ridd is one of the chief water powers on the Winnipeg River, which intersects the property. A striking contrast both in regard to methods of sale and prices realized is furnished by the public auction sale in September, 1906, under direction of the Dominion Government, when 1,234 acres of school lands were disposed of in three parcels. These lands adjoin water powers on the Winnipeg River, and are contiguous to the Ridd-Gerrle lands. They realized an average price of \$63.05 per acre, as against \$2.40 per acre for the 6,841 acres secretly disposed of by the Roblin Government.

Mr. Armstrong's Brokenhead Venture.

The transaction by which the local Government dispossessed itself of its land holdings in townships 14-15, range 8 E, is also one to which public attention should be drawn. These lands comprise 18,800 acres along the Brokenhead River. They passed from the possession of the Province on May 15, 1902, to D. S. Macdonald, of Portage la Prairie. Evidently the details of the transaction had been settled some time previously, because the records show that on May 1, D. S. Macdonald signed an agreement to quit-claim the land to Mr. Cameron Bartlett, manager of the Bank of Hamilton at Winnipeg. The land passed subsequently from Mr. Bartlett to Mr. C. A. Patterson, his successor as the manager of the Bank of Hamilton at this point, and from him to the Eastern Manitoba Land Company. The interest of the bank managers in this property was simply that they held it as collateral security for certain indebtedness to the bank.

The Eastern Manitoba Land Company is registered in the books in the Provincial Secretary's office as being made up of five parties, one of whom is Mr. Hugh Armstrong, M. P. P. for Portage la Prairie. With the aid of the official record it is not difficult, assisted by what is known otherwise, to tell a pretty complete story of this transaction. The actual purchaser, an investigation would undoubtedly show, was Mr. Hugh Armstrong, who was then a member of the Provincial Legislature. He bought this land from the Provincial Government by private sale at from \$2.00 to \$2.25 per acre. A well-known business man was permitted by Mr. Armstrong to come in and assume half the liability to the Province upon the payment of a high initiation fee. Subsequently this land was sold to third parties, part of it at \$3.50 per acre, and part at \$4.50 per acre. Mr. Armstrong's profit on the transaction must have run to a very tidy sum indeed.

W. Richardson's Great Coup.

The sale of townships 4-5, ranges 7-8 E., in December, 1905, was also typical of the manner in which the public lands have been jobbed off. The Province owned these four solid townships of land. The area embraced 80,386 acres. This was sold by private sale to W. Richardson, of Portage la Prairie. The bulk of the land was sold for \$3.00 an acre, and a portion of it for \$3.75. In this transaction Mr. Richardson was the agent or representative of a syndicate of Portage la Prairie Conservatives, the identity of some of whom it is not difficult to guess.

On November 25, 1905, the chief clerk of the Provincial Lands Department, wrote to Richardson about these lands:

"Another party endeavored to arrange with the Commissioner (Mr. Roblin is the Commissioner) after you left, but the Commissioner would not accept cash deposit, as you had agreed to purchase. Advise and we will return deposit."

Thus Mr. Richardson had an option on those 80,386 acres. He had made a deposit of \$1,000, thereby securing the option. If he could not land a purchaser, he had only to advise the Department, the \$1,000 would be returned to him, and the option would be off. Meanwhile, Mr. Roblin, as Commissioner of Provincial Lands, refused to entertain another offer for the lands.

On November 28, 1905, Mr. Richardson wrote to the chief clerk, telling him to let the matter stand, and adding that he would "see the Commissioner with whom I made the deal." The Commissioner referred to in these tallmanic words, be it remembered, is Mr. R. P. Roblin. Shortly after "the deal" was concluded by the lands passing into the hands of Mr. Richardson and his associates.

Clause 4 of the Regulations Governing the Sale of Provincial Lands, says:

"In the event of there being more than one applicant for any parcel of land, tenders shall be asked for the same by posting up notices thereof in the vicinity of said lands, either in the post offices or in other public places, and by mailing to each of said applicants notice thereof twenty-one days before said tenders are to be received, tenders to state amount to be paid over and above upset price."

In regard to this 80,386 acres sold to Mr. Richardson and his associates, Mr. Roblin, as Commissioner of Provincial Lands, forgot all about Clause 4. He forgot to act as trustee for Manitoba, and acted, instead, in the interest of the little syndicate represented by Mr. Richardson.

This land, sold by the Province in December, 1905, at about \$3.00 an acre, was sold in August, 1906, to a syndicate of London, Ontario, capitalists, who organized the "Manitoba Wheat Lands Company." This Company, after reserving ten thousand of the choicest acres, put the remaining 70,000 acres on

the market. In an advertisement in the Globe of Nov. 13, 1906, it was announced that this property was for sale in quantities of a section or less at \$8.50 an acre. "All this property," said the advertisement, "is good wheat land;" and it was further pointed out that it was within 40 miles of Winnipeg.

"Good wheat land," within 40 miles of Winnipeg, which was worth \$8.50 an acre in November, 1906, should not have been sold for \$3.00 an acre in December, 1905, to a party friend by a secret deal.

A brief calculation will show that the difference between the price at which the Province sold to the speculators and the price at which the speculators are selling to the settler is about \$5 an acre; which on \$80,000 acres amounts to \$400,000. A mere trifle!

"Options" or "No Options."

In the Legislature during the session of 1906, the Opposition paid some attention to the land transactions of the Provincial Government, digging up and bringing to light some of the particulars of the Ridd-Gerrle, the Brokenhead, the Dyck and the Richardson deals.

During the session Mr. Roblin, who is the Commissioner of Lands for the Province, declared on various occasions that the Department of Provincial Lands never gave options on Provincial lands. The lands, he said, were listed at fixed prices and anybody could get them. "Provincial lands have never been sold" Mr. Roblin declared to Mr. Lagimodiere, Feb. 7, 1906, "except in the open market."

This statement by Mr. Roblin was confirmed by the evidence given before the Public Accounts Committee on March 15, 1906, by L. J. Howe, Chief Clerk of the Department of Provincial Lands. Horace Chevrler, M. P. P., being the questioner, the following examination took place:

"Does your Department hold any lands in reserve or give a prospective customer an option on any land?"

"The Department never reserved any land—that is, not as a principle. "There was a case, for instance, down in 15-11 East, where a farmer wanted forty acres—a legal subdivision. "We could not sell it to him because it had not been valued, but we put his name down for the parcel pending the time that we could receive an idea of its worth. One or two other cases of the same kind have taken place, and this is the only way in which reserves or options have been granted by the Department."

"Then I am to understand that the Department never grants an option or reserve?"

"Yes."

Here we have Mr. Roblin, the Commissioner of Lands, and his deputy declaring officially to the Legislature that they did not give options.

On February, 7, 1907, at the South

Winnipeg Conservative convention, Mr. Rogers made a speech in defence of the Government's land transactions in which, in an unguarded moment, he admitted that Mr. Roblin's statement the previous year was not true.

Mr. Rogers defended the sale of 80,000 acres en bloc to W. Richardson by contending that the price obtained by the Government (a little over \$3 an acre) was all the land was worth. Pointing to Mr. Hugh John Macdonald, who was sitting near him on the platform, Mr. Rogers, in a fatally unguarded moment said:

"Hon. Hugh John Macdonald here 'had the lands under option and offered 'them at \$2.50 an acre and got no 'offers'"

Mr. Rogers thus stated publicly that Mr. Hugh John Macdonald had been given an option on these lands at a lower price than the Richardson group got them for, and that he had not been so fortunate as to find a purchaser. Mr. Macdonald, sitting there at Mr. Rogers' elbow on the platform at the South Winnipeg rally, did not deny the fact thus divulged by Mr. Rogers.

There is something pathetic in the figure that presents itself to the mind's eye of Mr. Hugh John Macdonald as an option-peddler, failing to find a purchaser and dropping out of the game, to be succeeded by Mr. Richardson and his friends, who sold out so very profitably.

What the Facts Indicate.

The facts all point to one conclusion—that our Provincial lands have been administered on the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number of party workers.

They have been jobbed off in large amounts to party friends on nominal terms of payment. Practically all that was necessary was to pay one-tenth of the price and interest on the balance until the land was turned over and the profits made.

In some cases lands were sold on valuations that were years old, thus enabling the purchasers to get them at but a portion of their true value. In many cases the land was sold to figureheads and stool pigeons and the names of the actual purchasers have never been made public.

In at least one case large quantities of land were sold at a cut price to favored purchasers.

Results of Sales by Auction.

In striking contrast to this method of disposing of the public domain is the system followed by the Dominion Government in selling school lands. School lands were sold at public auction during October and November of last year at 15 points in Manitoba, with the result that 121,000 acres of land were sold for \$1,468,326, averaging \$12.13 per acre.

LOOTING THE M. & N. W. LANDS.

In the year 1890 the Greenway Government made an arrangement with the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway—then in a receiver's hands—by which it took over 542,560 acres of land selected from its land grant from the Dominion Parliament in full settlement of its claim against the railway for its debt to the Province on account of the M. & N. W. debentures.

This debt had been incurred under these circumstances: In 1885 the Province, to assist in the building of this road, issued 25 year 5 per cent. debentures to the value of \$787,426 and turned the proceeds over to the company, which as security, pledged an acre of land for every dollar thus advanced. As this land was sold a percentage was to be paid to the Government and husbanded in a trust fund to retire the debentures upon their maturity in 1910. The interest upon these debentures was to be paid by the company.

The arrangement did not work out. The railway could not sell the lands, nor could it pay the annual interest upon the debentures amounting to \$39,726 yearly.

How the Province Got the Lands.

The Province to protect its credit was obliged to pay this interest. By May, 1899, the debt of the road to the Province for principal and interest amounted to \$1,221,000, according to the agreement between the company and the Government as set forth in chapter 19 of the 1890 Statutes. In payment of this debt the Province took over absolutely 542,560 acres, to be selected by Provincial officers. The Financial Commission of 1900 found that the company's indebtedness to the Province was \$1,158,784 (sessional papers 1900, page 426).

Mr. Greenway in the Legislature July 20, 1899, said that it was the intention of the Government to sell these lands "only to actual settlers."

Receipts Put in a Trust Fund.

Up to the time the Greenway Government went out of office only 7,631 acres (sessional papers 1900, page 310) were sold and the moneys received were duly placed in a trust account (page 33, sessional papers, 1900) as stipulated by section 9, of the Railway Aid Act of 1885.

Mr. Roblin, in the Legislature and during the campaign of 1899, denounced this settlement in unmeasured terms.

Speaking at Carman on August 17, 1899, he referred to it repeatedly as a "monstrous transaction," saying also that the administering of these lands "would give the Government patronage, and perhaps something more than 'patronage.'" The arrangement was "an infamous deal" as late as Dec. 13, 1901, when Mr. Roblin spoke at Holland.

The Trust Destroyed.

In the session of 1900, the first of the Conservative regime, it was pro-

vided in chapter 43 that "all real property acquired by the agreement with the Manitoba and North Western shall be subject to the administration and dealt with and disposed of as other lands of the Province, and proceeds realized from the disposition of such lands shall from time to time be placed to the credit and form part of the consolidated revenue fund."

The effect of this was to destroy the trust; and since that date all the proceeds of these lands have been put into current revenue in place of being husbanded to retire the debentures which mature in 1910.

These receipts have been very large because the Roblin Government abandoned the Greenway Government's plan of selling only to actual settlers, and have disposed of the land in large quantities to speculators, who have disposed of it or are holding it at large advances.

Large Receipts from the Lands.

Up to the end of 1902, as set forth in the annual report of the land department, this land was sold in these quantities:

| | Acres | Average | Total |
|-----------|---------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1899 | 7,631 | \$2.76 | \$ 21,092 |
| 1900 | 10,364 | 3.00 | 31,131 |
| 1901 | 102,204 | 3.10 | 317,841 |
| 1902 | 202,776 | 4.00 | 812,125 |
| | <hr/> 323,065 | | <hr/> \$1,172,179 |

Since 1902 the Government in its annual reports has given no information about the M. & N. W. lands, but it is known, from a statement made by Mr. Agnew in his budget speech in 1906 that up to the end of 1905 there had been sold, all told of this land, 420,728 acres. This shows that during 1903, 1904 and 1905 the sale of M. & N. W. land amounted to 97,663 acres, presumably at \$4 per acre. At the beginning of 1906 Mr. Agnew estimated that the remaining 121,831 acres were worth \$4 an acre—a very low estimate in view of the prices at which adjoining lands have been sold. Should this land be disposed of at these figures the amount which the Province will receive, as principal, from the M. & N. W. lands can be closely estimated as follows:

| | Acres. | Average. | Total |
|---|---------|----------|-------------------|
| 1899-02 | 323,065 | \$3.62 | \$1,172,179 |
| 1903-05 | 97,663 | 4.00 | 380,652 |
| 121,831 acres unsold Jan. 1, '06, at \$4.00 per acre | | | 487,324 |
| | | | <hr/> \$2,040,155 |

As the yearly interest on deferred payments will more than pay all the costs of management and charges of administration, the Province will get over two million dollars clear in cash out of lands taken by the Greenway Government in payment of a debt of less than a million and a quarter.

This is a triumphant vindication of what Mr. Roblin denounced as a "monstrous transaction."

Lands Jobbed Off to Friends.

Even under the wasteful and improvident management of these lands by

which they have been jobbed off by private dealers to party friends the Province will clear at least \$800,000; while under careful management by which these lands would have been held and sold only to actual settlers, the profits resulting from this transaction would have amounted to sufficient to wipe out the entire bonded indebtedness of the Province when the Liberals left office.

A Fallacious Defence.

The defence which the Government makes for using these moneys in place of putting them in a trust fund is that because the Province was obliged for many years to pay the interest on the M. & N. W. debentures out of the moneys in its possession, owing to the receipts from the lands not being sufficient to meet these charges, it is now entitled to repayment. This argument is entirely fallacious, because these payments which were all made by the Greenway Government were made not from current revenues of the Province but from borrowed money which has not yet been repaid. The Provincial Treasurer for Manitoba in 1899 (Sir D. H. McMillan) in accounting for the \$2,500,000 borrowed by the Greenway Government during its tenure of office said: "The next item, \$732,669, includes "the money we have been obliged to "pay on the bonds given to the Manitoba and North Western Railway and "the Hudson's Bay Railway." This amount, still owing for interest, is included in the Provincial debentures which mature in 1923 and 1928. It is very proper that these advances should be repaid out of the present receipts of the lands but they can only be repaid by opening a special trust account and putting the money to its credit. The liability is not discharged by turning the receipts into current revenue and spending them from year to year.

No Provision to Repay the Debt.

The surplus moneys from this source have not been husbanded to retire the M. & N. W. debentures which mature in three years' time, but they are put into current account to swell the apparent surplus. Lands purchased in the Quill Lakes district by speculators from the Government and not yet settled upon are held at from \$10 to \$15 an acre; and had the 542,530 acres been held by the Province this tract today would be worth at least \$5,000,000.

THE CAMPBELL-PRITCHARD EPISODE.

Before the Insurance Commission at Ottawa on Nov. 5, 1906, Mr. A. W. Pritchard, of Winnipeg, gave some interesting evidence as to certain sales of land which, acting as agent for the vendors, he had made to the Union Trust Co.

One of these transactions was the sale some three years ago of 40,000 acres of land belonging to the Ontario, Manitoba & Western Land Co., of which Hon. Collin H. Campbell was president and J. W. Bettes, secretary. Mr. Pritchard, who at that time was a member of the Provincial Civil Service, said he had offered this land to Mr. Foster at \$5; and it was accepted on the understanding that there was to be a commission of 25c. an acre which would be divided between Mr. Foster and Mr. Pritchard. Mr. Pritchard's evidence as to what happened to his share of the commission is quoted from the official report:

Mr. Tilley to Mr. Pritchard:

Q—"That left \$5,000 to you and \$5,000 to Foster?" A—"It left \$5,000."

Q—"Why don't you say yes? Was there something that was not for yourself?" A—"Well, there was something that I did not get."

Q—"What did you not get?" A—"Well, Mr. Campbell—"

Q—"What Campbell?" A—"The attorney-general. He thought that he had had a good deal of trouble over these lands in one way and another and he ought to come in for \$1,000, so I finally consented to let him have that amount."

Q—"You say that Mr. Campbell, who was president of the selling company?" A—"Yes."

Q—"He said to you that he thought that for his trouble he should get \$1,000?" A—"Yes."

Q—"When did he say that?" A—"Well, as I received these letters or telegrams I showed them to Mr. Campbell."

Q—"That is to say you kept Mr. Campbell, who is the president of the company, advised as to the progress of matters as they were going on?" A—"Yes."

Q—"That is to say you were candid in disclosing everything to him?" A—"Yes."

Q—"During the progress of the negotiations?" A—"Yes."

Q—"Did you disclose to him that you had written to Mr. Foster offering to divide the commission?" A—"Well, I think that was disclosed by the telegram which he—"

Q—"Which telegram?" A—"The telegram mentioning the commission."

Q—"The one you sent?" A—"No, the one I received from Mr. Foster."

Q—"Then up to that time had Mr. Campbell suggested that the \$1,000 should be paid to him?" A—"No. It was when the thing was finally going through, when it was a bargain."

Q—"So that nothing was said by him as to the division of the commission until the matter was ready to close?" A—"Yes, that is right."

Q—"Tell us just what was said." A—"Well, he said, 'I think that it would be to your advantage to give me \$1,000 of this commission.'"

Q—"What did he mean by that?" A—"I said 'On what ground? What have you done for it?' And he said, 'Well, it will be to your advantage to give me that amount,' and he said, 'You go and think it over.' So I went home and thought it over, and I thought there must be something brewing or he would not say that unless it was true; so I phoned him and said that I decided to give him the \$1,000 and he said, he thought that I had acted wisely. I gave him the \$1,000 cash. I kept the balance, \$4,000."

Mr. Campbell's Evidence.

On Nov. 12 Mr. Campbell gave evidence on his own behalf before the commission. We give it for what it is worth:

Mr. Campbell said it was absolutely untrue that he told Pritchard it would be to his advantage to give him (Campbell) \$1,000. The witness was not around when the document making the sale was closed. No such conversation as Pritchard stated ever took place. Pritchard said that he (Campbell) stated that Pritchard acted wisely in giving the \$1,000. "I never said anything of the kind," said Mr. Campbell. The witness also denied that he ever got any telegrams or letters from Foster and when Pritchard said he handed him letters and papers he said what was untrue.

Mr. Campbell explained that difficulties arose out of the agreement as made by Pritchard. The company had no title to the land and what Pritchard sold was the title. He (Campbell) straightened the matter out at Pritchard's request. He told Pritchard that the matter would have to be paid for out of his commission.

"The agreement was fixed up satisfactorily to all parties," said Mr. Campbell. "I asked him to give me my fees. Prior to this I had been endeavoring to make a sale of other lands that were in his hands. I was to do some work for him in England in connection with his lands. I rendered adequate services and was paid by him \$1,000. There was no intimation of any kind as he suggests. I was paid in cash, but not in the cash which he received as commission from the lands. When he paid it he said that he was perfectly satisfied."

Mr. Campbell said that he never told and one about getting the \$1,000. He had correspondence with the Union Trust Co.

"How many letters," said Mr. Tilley, "did you send to the Union Trust Co.?"

"I think there were two letters. Including letters and telegrams there would be five or six."

"Was that all the services you rendered for the \$1,000?"

"That was all that is pertinent to the enquiry. If the chairman wishes I will tell what else, but not otherwise."

Mr. McTavish—"It is not pertinent to this enquiry."

Mr. Campbell—"No."

"Were the services before or after November 6?" asked Mr. Tilley.

"Some before and some after."

"Did you suggest \$1,000 as a reasonable fee?"

"Yes, but there was something else done for him and he agreed to the amount."

"During all that time you were president of the Ontario and Manitoba Western Lands Co. and Attorney-General?"

"That has nothing to do with the payment of the \$1,000. I never disclosed it to anyone and forget all about it until it came up here."

MR. ROBLIN'S SECRET DEAL IN C.N.R. LANDS.

Mr. Roblin, since becoming Premier of Manitoba, has had secret business relations with the Canadian Northern Railway, a corporation which he has heaped with favors. This important fact came out incidentally in the investigation into the affairs of the Union Trust Company by the Insurance Commission. Among the blocks of land purchased by the Union Trust Company was one of some ten thousand acres in the Swan River country, which was bought from H. W. Whitla, barrister, of Winnipeg. Mr. Whitla was called to give evidence about this transaction; and in doing so he made the fact public that he was only the nominal owner of these lands, the actual owner being R. P. Roblin. Mr. Whitla, who gave his evidence under oath (Nov. 5, 1906), said: "I originally took these lands from the Canadian Northern Railway Company for one Gordon, and for the Hon. R. P. Roblin in equal shares." The price was \$3.10 per acre, and the first annual payment of \$1,500 was made May 3, 1902. In the following August, Mr. Gordon sold out his interest to Mr. Roblin. Mr. Whitla was then asked: "Then from that time you held the lands for Mr. Roblin only?" To which he replied: "That is true."

In 1905 Mr. Roblin sold this land to the Union Trust Company for \$5.25 per acre, allowing a commission of 25c per acre to Geo. E. Foster.

Notwithstanding this sworn testimony of Mr. H. W. Whitla given at Ottawa on Nov. 5, Mr. Roblin declared at Boisbervain on Dec. 28, as reported in the Telegram, that he had never bought an acre of land from the Canadian Northern Railway.

THE H.B. LAND DEAL—SELLING 256,000 ACRES FOR \$400,000.

The Norquay Government in 1880 issued provincial debentures to the extent of \$256,000, and gave the proceeds to the Hudson's Bay Railway to build some forty miles of railway from Winnipeg to Lake Manitoba.

The Railway Company was to give the province as security an interest in 256,000 acres from its land grant to be earned by the building of the road. After the Norquay Government gave the debentures, the Dominion Government refused to give the Railway Company its land grant, on the ground that the railway line was not up to specifications. (It had in reality been built simply for political ends, and it was never operated.) Thus the Province was "stuck" for \$256,000, and interest of \$12,807 for twenty-four years, amounting in all to \$559,868 (without compounding compound interest, as might justly be done).

Some twelve years later the Canadian Northern Railway took over the charter of the Hudson's Bay Railway, which included the right to a land grant. In the year 1898 the Manitoba Legislature assisted the Canadian Northern Railway by a guarantee on its bonds to the extent of \$8,000 a mile to build from Sifton Junction to Swan River (Chap. 43, Statutes of 1898); and by sub-section 4 of clause 1 of this enactment it was provided that "the company shall, from and out of any land grant that may be earned in respect of the line of railway hereby authorized to be aided, bind itself to convey and transfer or cause to be conveyed and transferred to the Government of Manitoba 256,000 acres of land fairly fit for settlement." This was to be in settlement of this old outstanding liability of the Hudson's Bay Railway.

The land grant was earned in the following year; and in 1903, during the administration of Hugh John Macdonald, the selection was begun. By the terms of the arrangement between the Province and the Company the selection was to be made from the C.N.R. lands lying between Lakes Winnipeg and Manitoba, and was to extend to other land holdings of the Company only in the event of an insufficient amount of land fairly fit for settlement being found in the area between the lakes. The original land grant, earned by the Canadian Northern Railway, by the construction of its line from Gladstone to Dauphin, was specially exempted from the agreement.

When the Roblin Government came into office this land selection stopped and was never resumed. In the session of 1903 the Opposition condemned the Government for this neglect, and Mr. Roblin made a formal defence in his address at Carman, March 31, 1903, which was printed and spread broadcast over the Province. He said:

"If you want to know who is responsible for the delay in making the se-

lection, I can tell you. It is Mr. Greenway's Liberal friends at Ottawa, who are refusing to make the survey, for I charge upon the Liberal party at Ottawa the responsibility for not having that area of land surveyed so that we can make our selection."

In the Legislature, in January, 1904, Hon. Mr. Rogers made the same defence. "The Government," he said, "had sent its inspectors out and had selected 3,000 acres, but then came to a full stop. Although they had made repeated representation to the Ottawa Government, they could get nothing done in regard to those unsurveyed lands which had placed the Manitoba Government in such an unfair position."

The correspondence between the Province and the Dominion Government with respect to the surveying of this land was brought down during the 1904 session of the Dominion House. This showed that when Mr. Roblin made his complaint against the Department of the Interior at Carman, the Province had never asked the Dominion to survey these townships; while the "repeated representations" of Mr. Rogers' speech dwindled into one letter from L. J. Howe, chief clerk of the Department of Provincial Lands, Manitoba, to the Department of the Interior at Ottawa, bearing date Nov. 14, 1903—six months subsequent to Mr. Roblin's speech. In this letter Mr. Howe stated:

"In connection with the selection of the 256,000 acres from the land grant of the Canadian Northern Railway Company which this department is entitled to, I am directed to ask if it would not be possible for the Department of the Interior to have the townships contained in the grant lying between Lakes Winnipeg and Manitoba subdivided at an early date in order that the work of selection may be carried on by this Department."

On Nov. 26, 1904, P. G. Keyes, Secretary of the Department of the Interior, replied, stating:

"With regard to your request that townships contained in the grant lying between Lakes Winnipeg and Manitoba may be subdivided at an early date in order that the work of selection may be carried on by your Department, I am directed to say that when the programme of surveys for the coming year is being arranged the requirements as to surveys in the district mentioned will be carefully considered."

This was all the correspondence that took place between the two Governments relative to this matter of surveying these townships.

All the circumstances indicate that there was an understanding between the Railway Company and the Government that the land was never to be selected.

In May, 1903, the Canadian Northern Railway disposed of its entire land grant to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.

In May, 1904, the Canadian Northern Railway, not being in a position to transfer the 256,000 acres of land, "fairly fit for settlement," made an ar-

arrangement with the Provincial Government by which they agreed to pay \$400,000, in four annual instalments, with an initial payment of \$20,000. This arrangement, though agreed upon in May, was not completed until the following November.

The effect of this transaction was that the province sold to the Canadian Northern 256,000 acres of land, "fairly fit for settlement," for \$400,000. This is at the rate of \$1.56 per acre.

The Roblin Government has put forward various defences for their course on this matter.

One much favored by Mr. Roblin some years ago, and put forward in his speech at Carman, March 31, 1903, was that Mr. Greenway was to blame, because he guaranteed the bonds before he got the lands. This is simply absurd. The company could not hand over the lands until it was in possession of them; it could not get possession of them until it built the road; and it was to enable it to build the road that the bonds were guaranteed.

Another defence is that the Dominion Government is responsible, because it refused to survey the townships from which the land was to be chosen, despite "repeated representations." This has been shown to be quite untrue.

It has also been claimed that, had the Government gone ahead and picked its lands in the unsurveyed townships, it would have been obliged to do so under terms set forth by the Canadian Northern, in a letter to the Government stating that the Province must accept a certain number of sections in each township. The reply to this is that the Canadian Northern Railway could not vary the terms of the contract, which called for land "fairly fit for settlement," and any township not possessing the requisite amount of land of this nature could be passed over in its entirety.

The Government selected much of its M. & N. W. land in unsurveyed townships, and it could have done the same with the H. B. lands had it desired to do so.

THE LOOTING OF THE LAND TITLES ASSURANCE FUND

When the Torrens' Title system of registration was adopted in 1890 provision was made that whenever a title was issued a small percentage of the value of the property—varying from 1-10th of one per cent. to 1-4th—should be paid into the Land Titles Assurance Fund. The Real Property Act provided that "any person sustaining loss or damage through any omission, mistake or misfeasance of the district registrar or of any of his officers or clerks" could sue and recover damages and "the Provincial Treasurer shall pay the amount of any judgment obtained, payable out of the Assurance Fund."

On Dec. 31, 1899, six days before the Liberals went out of power, this fund had grown until it amounted to \$75,275. A year later it had reached \$83,557.37.

In the session of 1901 the Roblin Government amended the Real Property Act, making the following provision about this Trust Fund:

"When the said fund shall have reached the sum of \$75,000 any sums in excess of the said amount may, by the direction of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council from time to time, be transferred to and form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the Province."

The Liberals had left the fund at \$75,000; Roblin thereupon declared that \$75,000 was a sufficient fund and all additional moneys received should go into general receipts.

Since that date the excess of the Land Titles Assurance Fund has been annually turned into Consolidated Revenue and spent as ordinary revenue. In 1901 the Government took \$15,000 from this trust fund; in 1902 nothing was taken; in 1903, \$20,000; in 1904, \$10,000; in 1905, \$15,000; in 1906, \$12,000—a total of \$72,000 deflected from trust funds to ordinary revenue.

But this did not satisfy the Roblin Government. There still remained \$75,000 in cash in the fund, upon which they cast envious eyes. It was not long until they found a means of looting it, too.

In 1900 a lengthy bill, amending the Real Property Act, passed by the Manitoba Legislature was disallowed by the Dominion Government because it discriminated against Dominion land surveyors. In 1902 this bill was reintroduced to the Legislature. The Attorney-General (Mr. Campbell) explained that the bill was the same as that passed two years previously, excepting that Section 169, to which the Dominion Government had taken exception, had been deleted. The bill accordingly passed without being subject to the scrutiny of the Opposition. In point of fact, however, Section 155 had been modified in one very important respect, being made to read thus:

"The said fund shall be held by the Provincial Treasurer as trust moneys and may be invested from time to time in such securities as other trust funds of the Province may be invested in, or

may be utilized by direction of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council for the erection of buildings to be used as land titles offices."

Under this provision the Government could take the \$75,000 trust funds and invest them in buildings; and this has been done. It is understood that the fine new land titles building in Winnipeg has been built out of these funds. The public accounts give no information as to the diversion of this money. The trust account shows a present balance of \$78,000, but this is presumably in buildings, not in cash.

For all practical purposes the Land Titles Assurance Fund has ceased to exist. We may have its equivalent in the form of public buildings, but these buildings cannot fill the place for which the trust was designed. The idea underlying the legislation was that, if judgment for damages was ever obtained by a suitor who had suffered loss through the error of the Government's officials, the Government would have the money at hand to meet it. But obviously if the money is tied up in a building, it will not be available for this purpose.

SHABBY TREATMENT OF THE SCHOOLS

In the year 1893 the legislative grant to the public schools was \$130 per school. In that year there were 860 schools in the Province and the revenue of the Province was \$633,116.

By 1899 the number of schools had increased to 1313, while the revenue had grown to \$776,223. Thus the schools, in this six year period, increased 53 per cent., while the revenue only increased 22 per cent. But the Liberal Government continued to keep the school grant at the \$130 figure.

In the year 1905 (the latest for which official figures are available) there were 1,761 schools in operation in the Province—an increase of 34 per cent. over 1899; while in the same period the revenue had grown to \$1,860,899, or an increase of 140 per cent. The grant for schools, however, remained the same. For 1906 the revenue jumped to \$2,089,622, but the schools got no more out of it.

The school lands are administered by the Ottawa Government in the interest of the public schools of Manitoba and annual payments are made to the Province of Manitoba. During the last five years of Liberal administration the receipts from this source amounted, all told, to \$78,182; while for the last five years of the Roblin Government they reached \$563,233, or an excess of \$488,000. The Dominion Government, by a Liberal interpretation of the provisions governing this trust, turned over to the Province the interest on deferred payments in place of adding this to the fund. This was in response to an urgent request from Manitoba, set forth in a memorial presented to the Ottawa Government January 7, 1901, by the Manitoba Government, in

which the necessities of the country schools were pleaded as a reason for generous action by the Federal authorities.

The money thus paid to the Province included the accumulations of years. The first of these special payments, made in June, 1902, amounted to \$231,000; and subsequent payments from this same source were \$89,774 in 1905, and \$58,417.71 in 1906. Thus the sum of \$379,221 was specially given to the Manitoba Government to assist the public schools; Yet in not a single case was the grant to a school increased. The only benefit which the schools have received from these enlarged receipts has been the supplying of free text books, upon which the Government has expended some \$40,000 to date. The Normal School at Winnipeg was built out of this fund at a cost of \$100,000, and two smaller Normal Schools were built at St. Boniface and Maniton.

The balance of these special grants from Ottawa, amounting to at least \$200,000, has been practically taken from the schools and turned into general revenue; because, although this amount may have actually been given to the schools as part of their regular grants, an equal amount of money, which would have been paid out of the ordinary revenues had this money not come from Ottawa, was released for other purposes and was added to the Government's general expenditures.

When in 1898 the Dominion Government proposed to advance \$300,000 of the school moneys to the Province of Manitoba for the assistance of the schools, it was opposed by the Conservatives and the measure was thrown out in the Senate, which Conservatives at that time controlled. In discussing this proposition in the House of Commons Geo. E. Foster, said (Hansard, 1898, June 8, page 7,414):

"The Manitoba Government are, for instance, now spending, say \$200,000 for education, and if on receipt of this they cut down that vote to \$100,000, and supplement it by \$100,000 of this sum, using the present \$100,000 for other purposes, it is exactly the same as if they took this money and used it for other purposes."

This is exactly what the Roblin Government has done. They have taken advantage of the enlarged receipts from Ottawa to spend money, which otherwise they would have given to the schools, for other purposes; and to this extent the schools have been defrauded.

If the Dominion Government had retained possession of this money the schools would have been treated just as they have been except that they would not have been supplied with free text-books; but the Government's financial showing would not be so good.

This money from Ottawa has thus been an advantage, not to the schools, but to the Provincial Treasury.

HISTORY OF THE LIQUOR ACT

Plank No. 19 of the Conservative platform of 1890 reads as follows:

"That a measure be adopted to give effect to the will of the people regarding Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, which measure should go as far in the direction of Prohibition as the powers of the Province will allow."

Mr. Hugh John Macdonald said in the Legislature on June 11, 1900, in moving the first reading of the Liquor Act:

"The moment that plank went into the platform, and we as a party went before the country asking for support on that plank, coupled with others, my course was clear, to carry out honestly the pledge made to the people. Nothing can more lower a public man and a party than to have it supposed by the people that specific, definite pledges are like pie-crust, made to be broken."

On June 13, 1900, Colin H. Campbell declared that the verdict of the electorate in placing the Conservative party in power was a constitutional mandate to the Government to enact and enforce the Liquor Act. The Conservative party, he added, "always fulfilled the pledges it made to the people even if it meant defeat." He defended the Conservative party from the insinuation that it was not sincere in enacting the Liquor Act, and announced that he supported the Act "because he was conscientiously convinced that it was perfectly valid, and that it would effectively suppress the liquor traffic."

Nothing could be more explicit than the declarations by Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Campbell in the Legislature.

Neither Mr. Roblin nor Mr. Rogers nor any other member uttered a syllable of dissent from the declarations Mr. Macdonald made; not one of them voted against the measure.

The Liquor Act, as passed by the local Legislature of 1900, contained the following provision:

"121. This Act shall come into force and operation on the first day of June, 1901."

In order to allow time for the measure to be carried before the Imperial Privy Council,—the Court of Queen's Bench of Manitoba had declared it unconstitutional,—an amending statute was passed at the 1901 session of the Legislature, providing that the Act should come into force "on proclamation" by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council."

The case was argued before the Imperial Privy Council in July, 1901, Mr. Campbell appearing before their Lordships; and on being asked what he had to say in defence of the Act, uttering that memorable masterpiece of forensic art: "Nothing, my Lords."

The Privy Council's decision was given on November 22, 1901, declaring the Act wholly within the powers of the Legislature. The Government were thus enabled to go ahead and proclaim the Act.

On Jan. 9, 1902, after some weeks of unbroken silence, announcement was made in the press that the Government had decided to submit the Liquor Act to a vote of the people.

On February 19, 1902, Collin H. Campbell introduced the Referendum Act into the Legislature. In this speech Mr. Campbell said:

"While the Act has great advantages, it has also great disadvantages, and might well be termed 'prohibition with a handicap.' It is not what the people thought they were getting. We would practically have an open sale of liquor."

The Referendum was held on April 2, 1902; only 38,071 votes were cast, although 73,837 names were on the list as entitled to vote. Of these 22,464 voted "No" and 15,607 "Yes." The Liquor Act thus was killed.

The following resolution was passed by the Manitoba Executive of the Dominion Alliance on April 23, 1902: "In the whole history of the Province no other election, municipal, provincial or federal, was ever characterized by such bribery, personation, perjury and fraud as the election on the Referendum. The vote on the 2nd Inst. was therefore no indication of the prohibition sentiment of this Province."

That thousands of the affirmative votes were cast by "repeaters" was notorious. This was made possible by permitting electors to vote anywhere in the Province upon taking or offering to take an oath in place of compelling them to vote in their own polling divisions where their names were on the list. This left the door wide open to perjury and personation.

This interpretation of the law was made by a lawyer retained by the Licensed Victuallers' Association. When it was made public the temperance leaders took alarm immediately and urged the Attorney-General to make a ruling on this point. The Attorney-General refused to make a public statement to them or to the press, though requested to do so; nor did he make any reference to it in his public address at Wawanessa on March 30, though he was expected to make an announcement at that place. Mr. Campbell knew that it was highly important that the public should be informed on this point. On the morning of polling day, April 2, the Free Press published a statement from the returning officer for Winnipeg, Mr. Hubbard, who declared that he had received no instructions, adding that "under the circumstances, voters may register their ballots at any poll they choose to." In Winnipeg and in the majority of constituencies throughout the Province electors (or non-electors) were free to vote at any poll.

After the polling Attorney-General Campbell issued a statement disclaiming any responsibility for this irregularity and declaring that he had issued a letter to the returning officers in-

instructing them to inform their deputies that electors could only vote at the polls where their name was on the list.

This letter bore date of March 26, but it did not reach the Winnipeg returning officer until the morning of April 3, the day after the election. By an extraordinary set of coincidences other returning officers far and near throughout the Province did not get the letter until too late, although in a few constituencies the letter reached the returning officers on election day. If Mr. Campbell had, however, given the public press the text of his instructions to the returning officers, not only they but the electors would have been posted as to the law, and the "bribery, personation, perjury and fraud," referred to by the Dominion Alliance would not have been possible except on a very contracted scale.

LICENSE SCANDALS

There have been at least a score of license scandals, during the Roblin term of office, arising in almost every case from the action of the commissioners in granting licenses in opposition to the wishes of the neighborhood.

The McCreary Case.

C. F. Czerwinski, chairman of the provincial council of Royal Templars, in a statement to the public press in November, 1905, declared that in a great majority of cases the increase in licenses had been made in defiance of the laws of the land. He gave as a typical case the facts about the granting of the license at McCreary, as follows:

"Let me tell very briefly the story of the last case before us, one not more striking than many others we have dealt with during the year. At McCreary, a little hamlet of about fifteen householders on the C. N. R. north of Neepawa, a license was applied for by one Tobin for a house owned by a man named Baudry. According to the act an application must be signed by sixteen of the nearest twenty householders, but Tobin's application was signed by people living miles away from the place, and did not contain even a majority of the residents of the little hamlet itself. The local council of Royal Templars took action and a protest was entered. Steps were taken to show the commissioners that the application did not meet the requirements of the law, and that even if it did there was no excuse for planting a liquor license in that little place. The protest was signed by seven or eight of the nearest fifteen householders comprising the village, and that alone should have been fatal to the application. The commissioners met at Dauphin, some distance away, and the council sent a representative there to ask for an adjournment, under the provisions of the law, that a meeting might be held at McCreary and a proper investigation made. At Dauphin the representative of the council, after he had made his plea to the commissioners, was assaulted by Baudry, the

owner of the house for which license was sought. He was not only sworn at and threatened, but was actually struck in the face. For this assault Baudry has since been convicted and fined. Such an incident alone should have been sufficient to show the commissioners that the house was not a proper place to receive a license.

"When the case came up for hearing at McCreary, nine of the nearest sixteen householders appeared as protestors. The law provides that license commissioners have a right to look for information and evidence in any way that they choose, but the commissioners in this case proceeded at once to rule out the protestors and declined to consider their objections. They objected to the Presbyterian minister on the ground that he sometimes used his house for public service and ruled that he was therefore not a householder and not entitled to be heard. Two other residents were ruled out on the ground that they kept boarders, and still another was refused a hearing because he had not signed the protest. Thus the residents of the place were disposed of by the commissioners, and the license granted."

Other Similar Scandals.

By precisely similar methods—arbitrarily counting some parties as householders and barring out others, according to the necessities of the case—licenses have been granted despite the opposition of nearby residents in Elm Creek, Carman, Ethelbert, St. Rose du Lac, Napinka, Crystal City, Hartney, Edrans and other places.

In cities and towns where there are no requirements as to signers or protestors but the commissioners have full discretionary powers, there have been some glaring cases of the granting of licenses to party friends despite strong popular protests. In Winnipeg and neighborhood there were three such scandals: in quick succession, all of them relating to licenses applied for either directly or indirectly by Aime Benard, who is the Roblin candidate in Assiniboia.

Norwood.

In Norwood, a suburb of St. Boniface, a license was granted to a boarding house in the fall of 1903, although 157 resident property owners petitioned the commissioners not to permit a licensed hotel in the district; only six resident property owners refused to sign this protest. The people protested the license and Judge Myers, after a hearing, ordered it cancelled on the ground that D. E. Sprague, one of the license commissioners, had a second mortgage on the building. The commissioners refused to cancel the license on the strength of a legal opinion obtained from J. A. M. Alkins, for which the Government paid \$100.

Ross Street, Winnipeg.

A year later, in 1904, Mr. Benard applied for a license for a boarding house on Ross street, Winnipeg. There were protests by the Winnipeg District Loyal Orange Association, and by the Board

of Zion Methodist church. Representatives of the church and spokesmen for parties in the neighborhood waited upon the commissioners and pleaded that the license be not granted. One of the parties who fought the granting of the license, Oliver Gilmer, hardware merchant, made an affidavit in which he declared:

"Mr. Benard said in my presence in discussing the Ross Street license, that he, Benard, had been told that he would not get a license on Ross Street as the residents were strongly opposed to it and that he, Benard, said he would get it in spite of the protest of the residents. When one of the persons present said that Judge Myers would stop him he said: 'To —with Judge Myers.'"

St. Boniface.

The license was duly granted. A year later, in the fall of 1905, an application was made for an hotel license for a new building in St. Boniface. The town already had four hotels. There was strong opposition, headed by Mgr. Dugas, rector of the Cathedral. The opposition was so threatening that the application was withdrawn for a time, but in the following April it was again made and was promptly granted. The action of the commissioners was denounced from the pulpit of the Cathedral by Mgr. Dugas. The manner in which the whole matter had been dealt with was, he said, condemnable; and it should be remembered by the citizens in due time.

Elmwood.

A notable illustration of the Government's tortuous methods in dealing with these matters was furnished during the session of 1906. The feeling in Winnipeg against the invasion of residential districts by licensed hotels was so strong that the Government brought in a bill restricting licenses to a defined area. This area as set forth in the bill did not include Elmwood, which is the section of the city east of the Red River; and a delegation of leading Presbyterians, including Principal Patrick and Rev. Dr. C. W. Gordon, which waited upon the Law Amendments Committee to make this point sure, was assured by Mr. Rogers that Elmwood was outside the area in which licenses could be granted. In confirmation he produced a map shewing the boundaries of the restricted area. The clergymen went away satisfied. On the last day of the session an amendment was quietly made to the bill extending the area to Elmwood; and the temperance leaders knew nothing about it until a hotel-keeper in Elmwood applied for and obtained a license.

It was this act of bad faith on the part of the Government that led to Loyal Orange Lodge 1913 passing the following resolution at a meeting held at the time:

"That L. O. L. 1913 strongly condemns the action of the Manitoba Government for its gross betrayal of the temperance party on the subject of segregation of liquor licenses in Winnipeg. That the inclusion of Elmwood in the

license area is a breach of faith and defiance of the spirit of the allied temperance reforms, but the only part and parcel of the way in which the Roblin Government has surrendered the people's interest to the liquor trust ever since the Hon. Hugh John Macdonald left the cabinet."

Methodists Condemn Governments Liquor Policy.

At a meeting of the standing committee of the Methodist conference held in Winnipeg in December, 1905, the conduct of license commissioners in granting licenses against local sentiment and in defiance of the law was severely censured. At this meeting reference was made to Alme Benard as a peddler of licenses, who was granted licenses that no one else could get and then disposed of them.

Certain members of the committee had arranged that a deputation should interview the Government, but the committee declined to take this action, and passed the following resolution instead:

"That, while appreciating the action of those of its members who have made arrangements for a deputation to wait on the Provincial Government, in the opinion of this committee, the conduct of the commissioners in the granting of licenses and the general lax policy of the Government in the administration of the license law, have been such that we feel that any specific representation on our part would be futile, and we, therefore, content ourselves with registering an emphatic protest."

At the Manitoba Methodist Conference held in Neepawa in June, 1906, this resolution was passed unanimously:

"That this conference deploras the enormous development of the liquor traffic in this Province, protests against the policy of the present Provincial administration in granting licenses in the interests of the traffic; approves heartily of the democratic principle of local option by the majority, and particularly with regard to the next election lays it on the conscience of its membership to scan closely the moral qualifications of parties and candidates."

SOME ROBLIN LIQUOR CANDIDATES

Alme Benard, who is contesting Assinibola, was for many years the owner of the Grand Central Hotel, Winnipeg, and the police court records show that he was twice fined for breaches of the license laws. He sold out in April, 1904; but in the following August he bought a boarding house on Ross Street, Winnipeg, got a license despite the opposition of the neighborhood and converted the boarding house into the Metropole Hotel. This was conducted in his own name until 1906, when he sold it for a large amount. Though

not now the holder of licenses in his own name, he is interested in hotels in Winnipeg, St. Boniface and other parts of the Province, and has been the hero of many scandals over the granting of licenses.

D. G. McKay, candidate for North Winnipeg, has been for years the Chief License Inspector for the Province and is directly responsible for the lax, inefficient and partial administration of the law.

John Lytle, the Roblin candidate in Springfield, is the owner of a licensed hotel at Tyndall.

THE LAC DU BONNET TELEGRAM

(Attorney-General's Department prevented the prosecution of an illegal seller of liquor.)

In the legislature during the session of 1905 Horace Chevrler, M. P. C., made the statement that on Nov. 1, 1904,—two days before the Dominion general election, Attorney-General Campbell had telegraphed the magistrate at Lac du Bonnet instructing him not to proceed with the prosecution of a keeper of a notorious shebeen, named Bruneau, against whom a warrant for the illegal selling of liquor had been issued.

Attorney-General Campbell, who was in the legislature at the time, made no comment upon Mr. Chevrler's statement, but subsequently, when the Free Press repeated the statement he gave an interview to the Telegram, Feb. 27, 1905, in which he declared: "No such telegram as they (the Free Press) published was ever sent, nor was there any interference, good, bad or indifferent by myself or by my department."

No more circumstantial denial could be made, and it was echoed in an equally positive disclaimer by the Telegram.

The Free Press repeated its charge and gave the wording of the telegram as follows:

"Winnipeg, Nov. 1, 1904.

"Thomas Houston,

"Lac du Bonnet.

"Do nothing in the liquor prosecution until you hear from me personally.

"COLIN H. CAMPBELL."

Mr. Campbell's rejoinder took the form of an editorial note, in the Roblin government's newspaper, as follows:

"The Free Press repeats its contemptible insinuations against the attorney-general on the ground of a telegram which has been explicitly denied."

The Free Press' rejoinder was to publish a photographic fac simile of the telegram accompanied by the fol-

lowing letter from Thos. Houston, the justice of the peace who received the telegram in question. That letter is herewith quoted in full:

Lac du Bonnet, March 20, 1905.

Sir,—I see by some statements published in the Telegram of the 27th of February, and said to be made by the attorney-general, that he (the Attorney-general) denies having interfered in any way with the liquor prosecution at Lac du Bonnet about which so much has been said in the public press and elsewhere lately. As these statements put me in a false position I will give you the particulars of the case.

On the second of November last a telegram was handed to me at Lac du Bonnet signed "Colin H. Campbell," advising me to do nothing with the liquor prosecution then pending till I heard from him personally.

In accordance with these instructions I let the prosecution stand, expecting to get an explanation from the attorney-general, but so far I have not got any.

To prove these statements and in order that there may be no misapprehension in regard to myself in reference to this matter, I enclose you herewith the telegram I refer to.

I might add that with any disagreement there may be between you and the attorney-general I have nothing whatever to do, but in justice to myself I ask you to publish this note, and also the telegram.

THOS. HOUSTON.

Further denial being useless, Mr. Campbell thereafter contented himself with declaring that he had nothing to do personally with the sending of the telegram, as he was out of the city the day it was sent.

This is neither a reply to, nor an explanation of, the charge. The telegram was plainly sent from the attorney-general's department by some official authorized to sign Mr. Campbell's name.

The attorney-general's department is thus convicted of having interfered with the course of justice on behalf of a breaker of the license laws—presumably in the supposed interests of the Conservative party in the Dominion election then pending.

The original telegram as delivered to Mr. Houston is now in the possession of the Free Press.

SUGGESTIVE LICENSE STATISTICS

In 1887, the last year of the Norquay Government, there were 216 liquor licenses in the Province of Manitoba.

In 1888, the first year of the Greenway Government, the number dropped to 199; and the following year to 140. Thereafter the number increased slowly, and in 1899, the last year of the Greenway Government, there were 167 licenses in force. Thus, during the 12 years of the Liberal regime, licenses fell from 218, in 1887, to 167 in 1899.

Since 1899 licenses have been issued as follows: 1900, 171; 1901, 188; 1902, 194; 1903, 220; 1904, 250; 1905, 254; official figures for 1906 are not available.

Under the old Liquor License Act a municipality could compel the holder of a liquor license to pay to the municipal funds an amount equal to the amount paid for the license. In 1905 the Government increased the charge for liquor license to \$500 in cities over 10,000; \$350 in cities less than 10,000; \$300 in towns less than 5,000 and over 2,500 population; \$200 in villages; and \$150 in rural municipalities; but the municipalities were prohibited from increasing their tax beyond the old figure.

THE BOUNDARY QUESTION NEVER A POLITICAL ISSUE

The boundary question has never been a political issue in Manitoba. The matter of the extension of the boundaries was first broached in the Legislature by Mr. Burrows, a Liberal.

The resolution adopted by the Legislature unanimously in 1901 was moved by Mr. Burrows, a Liberal, seconded by Mr. Myers, a Liberal.

The resolution of 1902 was moved by Mr. Roblin, a Conservative, and seconded by Mr. Burrows, a Liberal, and carried unanimously.

On every occasion when the matter was brought up in the Legislature, it was treated as a non-political question. With truth and reason, therefore, could Mr. Rogers and Mr. Campbell close their letter to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, written in February, 1905, asking for an extension of the boundaries, with these words:

"We sincerely trust that upon further consideration you may see your way clear to grant the request we make on behalf of a united Province.

"Yours faithfully,

"(Signed) R. ROGERS,

"C. H. CAMPBELL."

Mr. Rogers in a manifesto which he issued on April 4, 1905, said:

"I have all along taken the ground that the claim for the extension of Manitoba's boundaries is **not a political one; that is, it is not a party question**, and I was careful to make our position quite clear about this to Sir Wilfrid Laurier when we met at Ottawa, going so far at that time as to say that a fair and just settlement could not carry with it **any advantage or disadvantage to either political party.**

"The people of the Province have more than once unanimously put forward their claims. And our local Legislature was unanimous in 1901, in 1902 and again in 1904."

In 1906 a resolution asking the Dominion Parliament to extend the boundaries of Manitoba and instructing the executive council to present a memorial to the Dominion Government praying for this extension passed the Legislature unanimously.

The only occasion upon which any members of the Legislature ever voted against a resolution urging the exten-

sion of the boundaries of Manitoba was in the session of 1907, when the Reblin Government and its followers voted down the following resolution submitted by the Opposition:

"That this House reaffirms its claim for an extension of the present boundaries of the Province northwest and easterly, to comprise all the territory hitherto embraced within the district of Keewatin and now forming part of the Northwest Territories, and believe such a step to be of the highest importance to the interests of the Province of Manitoba and to the securing of good government for and the development of said territory; and would especially urge the Dominion Government to deal with such question of the extension of boundaries during the present session of the Dominion Parliament."

With the exception of the last clause this resolution was identical with the one moved in the session of 1906 by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Agnew and unanimously supported by the members of the House.

This resolution was moved by the Opposition as an amendment to the Government's resolution, which for the first time was partisan in its language. The Opposition, after their amendment had been defeated, supported the Government resolution, while disclaiming all responsibility for the terms in which it was set forth.

Liberal Resolution at Convention.

The resolution of the Liberal convention on the question of the boundary extension was as follows:

"That this convention is of the opinion that in order that Manitoba may take her rightful place in confederation it is essential that the area of the Province be increased to include that part of the present territory of Keewatin lying between the northern boundary of Manitoba and the Hudson Bay, and that our financial arrangements with Ottawa should be placed on the same basis as those of Alberta and Saskatchewan."

Views of Edward Brown.

Edward Brown, the Liberal leader, speaking on this question in Winnipeg on Nov. 13, 1906, said:

"Under the present administration the members of the Opposition have always loyally supported the Government upon this question in the House. It will be quite clear to you that the attitude of the Liberals of this Province is now, and always has been, strongly in favor of the extension of Manitoba's boundaries. I wish, therefore, to take advantage of this occasion in view of the conference now at Ottawa, to reiterate the stand we take upon this question.

"I say that we not only desire the boundaries to be extended but we express the hope that as the outcome of this conference this matter may be settled for all time. It may be pointed out by some of our friends that a political advantage will accrue to the Manitoba Government of the day in the settlement of the question now, in view of the near approach of the Provincial elections.

"Allow me to point out that that feature of the situation should not, and does not, for one moment deserve to be taken into consideration. If a satisfactory settlement of the question is reached we shall be willing to concede the Government any credit they are entitled to in this connection. Meanwhile the interests of the Province demand that the stand our party takes upon the question should be clearly understood.

"When in Ottawa recently I had the pleasure of calling upon the Premier, and in a very brief interview the question of better terms and extension of boundaries naturally came up. I assured Sir Wilfrid that the Liberals of this Province were unanimous in urging that ample justice be done to this Province, and in spite of the fact that the present Government of the Province had heaped so much abuse upon him, and had grossly misrepresented his attitude upon the question, that I was satisfied that the people of this Province had the fullest confidence that our claims would be determined upon their merits."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE INEFFICIENT

With the exception of the establishment of the Agricultural College Mr. Roblin, as Minister of Agriculture, has done but little to assist the farmers or encourage farming in this Province. As for the Agricultural College, while it is admittedly well-equipped and officered, its location, practically in the city of Winnipeg, is most unsuitable. Dr. S. J. Thompson, for many years Provincial veterinarian, speaking at the Liberal Convention, March 29, 1906, strongly condemned the selection of the Agricultural College farm. He said: "It is six chains wide and two miles long; half of it is a regular hay swamp. When water lies on this heavy land for years it is almost impossible to make use of it. If there was anything Mr. Roblin should be ashamed of it was putting the Agricultural College on 117 acres of land, more than half of which was in a hay swamp, when a few miles from there he could have got good high dry land, which would have been a credit to the country."

It has always been believed in Winnipeg that the College was placed in this unsuitable spot with a view to improving real estate values in the neighborhood for the benefit of friends of the Government, who held land in the neighborhood.

Department of Agriculture Under the Roblin Government, 1903 Onward.

In 1903 Mr. Roblin for the first time curtailed the published report of the live stock associations to a mere statement of their business meetings. Every paper read, every lecture given, every word of discussion was eliminated. This was the first time there had been any such condensation; but in the following

years of 1904-1905 even resolutions passed at business meetings were dropped out, probably because one resolution which was passed in 1904 and reaffirmed in 1905, protested against the papers, lectures and discussions not being printed. The report of the meetings of these associations held in February, 1906, has not yet seen the light of day, although the material was in the hands of the Department less than six weeks after the meetings were held at Brandon.

The printing of the lectures, papers and discussions at the annual meetings of the live stock associations and the judicious distribution of the report is one of the cheapest and most easily managed methods of disseminating agricultural information and furthering agricultural education. No satisfactory explanation has ever been given to the executives of the live stock associations why these bulletins have been cut down to mere business details. Nothing in the way of educational literature has been issued by the Department to take their place. The agricultural literature has been confined to the annual report of the Department, which is not very instructive, and the crop bulletins.

The Province of Ontario issues and distributes the report of the registrar of live stock, the annual report of the live stock associations, containing all papers, lectures and discussions at their meetings, and which last year ran to over 290 pages; the reports of fairs and exhibitions, a most valuable bulletin; no less than three volumes of Farmers' Institute reports, one of which contains the reports of meetings held among the women. Then there is the report of the Agricultural Union of Ontario, the annual report of the Agricultural College, the Good Roads report, the report of the Dairy Association, a perfect compendium of useful information on dairy subjects; and an excellent Poultry Association report.

Institutes Disorganized.

Under the Hon. Thos. Greenway, as Minister, and Hugh McKeellar, as Deputy, the Farmers' Institute meetings had been worked up to a high degree of efficiency and were doing much to increase interest in agricultural education. The very first year Mr. Rohlin was in power the meetings fell behind. With the appointment of J. W. Black as Deputy, there was a tremendous flourish of trumpets as to what was to be done at institute meetings. In June, 1905, a very good programme of meetings with good speakers was arranged, but by this time interest was at low ebb and the meetings were not a success from the standpoint of attendance. Since then nothing in the line of a regularly and well planned institute campaign has been attempted.

No Help for Cattle Sales,

In 1904 the executives of the various live stock associations, feeling the need of a yearly distribution of pure-bred animals, such as can only be obtained through an auction sale at some central point, decided to avail them-

selves of the standing offer of the Dominion Government to contribute \$650 to the holding of such sale. They communicated with the Department at Ottawa and were told that the grant would be theirs if a sale was held under the usual regulations of the Department. They next sought the co-operation of Mr. Roblin and his department in the matter, pointing out the great advantage to be gained by the holding of such a sale, the assistance that the Dominion was ready to grant and the work that could be accomplished if his department would co-operate and help them in the matter of a suitable building, etc. The moment that he knew the Dominion Government was to have any share in the management of the sale Mr. Roblin turned the proposition down entirely, absolutely refusing assistance of any kind.

Ultimately the C. P. R. railway came to the rescue of the live stock men, erected a commodious sale pavilion and stables, and two sales have been held, to each of which the Dominion duly contributed the promised amount of \$650, and in addition supplied men to attend and assist in every way in describing the merits of the animals offered, etc. At each sale either the Dominion commissioner of live stock or his deputy has attended and given all possible assistance.

Live Stock Judging.

In the year 1903 the live stock associations began the work of live stock judging in connection with their annual meetings. This meant a very heavy increase in the cost of their annual gatherings, but the grants from the Provincial Legislature have never been increased. All the speakers for these meetings and for conducting the live stock judging classes have been supplied by the Dominion Government and paid for by them. These classes have increased in interest year by year. Their benefit to agricultural interests is undeniable, but the Manitoba Department of Agriculture has spent neither time nor money upon them.

Seed Special.

In September, 1905, when the first meeting was held to consider the advisability of sending out seed demonstration trains, Hon. R. P. Roblin and the then deputy minister were both invited. Neither attended nor sent any reason for not attending. When the sending out of the train was decided upon they were again asked to co-operate. This time a promise in writing was sent that the Department would do so; but the matter ended there. During the months of preparation from September to January, when the train started, there was much labor in the preparing of advertising, the securing of bulletins for distribution, etc., and the Dominion Government, the Provincial Governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan and the railway companies worked hand in hand; but the Manitoba Department of Agriculture did no work and contributed nothing to the expenses. Hon. R. P. Roblin, though offered special transportation to Brandon to attend the starting of the train,

declined to be present, nor was he represented by his deputy.

The train toured Manitoba for four weeks, more than half of the entire time it was out, yet for not one day of that time was there a representative from the Manitoba Department of Agriculture on board, nor did the department furnish a single copy of any bulletin for distribution. Alberta and Saskatchewan not only supplied speakers but the deputy minister of agriculture for Alberta and the minister of agriculture for Saskatchewan personally attended the train in their respective provinces and furnished the best bulletin on noxious weeds that has yet been published in the west, by the thousand, for distribution.

When the local Legislature met not only the minister of agriculture but the members from Mountain and Cypress River took the opportunity of speaking slightly of the work of the seed selection special train, speaking of it as cheap advertising for the Dominion Government. The cheap advertising cost the Dominion \$4,500 and the railway companies something like \$50,000.

Unsolicited testimony from all over the country goes to prove that this seed train was one of the best pieces of educational work ever done, and the Manitoba Department of Agriculture had neither part nor lot in it.

An Auctioneer for Deputy Minister.

When W. J. Black vacated the position of deputy minister to become principal of the agricultural college, the position was filled by the appointment of J. J. Golden. Mr. Golden was for many years an auctioneer in the city of Winnipeg, and was afterwards in charge of the Government's Immigration office in Winnipeg. He has no known qualifications for the position of Deputy minister, which should be filled by an experienced and thoroughly competent agriculturist. Another freak appointment made by Mr. Roblin as minister of agriculture was that of R. G. O'Malley as inspector of noxious weeds. Mr. Golden and Mr. O'Malley make a great team to represent the Department of Agriculture at gatherings of hard-headed intelligent farmers.

The Liberal Policy.

The Liberal platform calls for an advanced agricultural policy. The plank dealing with this policy reads thus:

"That as Manitoba is pre-eminentely a farming province the encouragement of agriculture in all its branches should be the first duty of the Government, and that its agricultural department should include a commercial intelligence branch."

DISFRANCHISING MARRIED WOMEN

In the session of 1906 an amendment to the Municipal Act, introduced by the Government, and put through without dissent by its obedient majority, deprived married women owning property of the right to vote in municipal elections. At that time a local option campaign was in progress in Carman and in Gladstone, and in both places the names of the women were struck from the lists.

With respect to the Carman list, the Dufferin Leader, published in that town, says:

"The solicitor for the town of Carman went to Winnipeg and had an interview with the Attorney-General and asked him whether the married women then on the authorized town lists would be allowed to vote. The Attorney-General replied that 'he was preparing to leave for the East and had not time to look into the matter,' and that was all the satisfaction that the town solicitor got."

The solicitor subsequently advised the town council that the women were not eligible to vote.

Between the local option vote in Carman and the local option vote in Gladstone there was a money by-law voted on in Brandon. The municipal authorities in Brandon applied to the Attorney-General for a ruling in regard to the married women whose names were on the list, and were told that as the names were on the list they might be allowed to stand. The question then arose in Gladstone whether the women should or should not vote on local option, and the town clerk requested a ruling from the Attorney-General, who stated that if the town solicitor, who was a Portage la Prairie barrister, came to him he would talk to him. The town solicitor could not be communicated with immediately, and the result was that the vote was taken without the Attorney-General having given the ruling that the town clerk had asked for, and, as in Carman, the women were debarred from voting.

The disfranchising amendment having thus served the purpose for which it was designed—namely, of barring out married women from voting on local option in Carman and Gladstone—was repealed at the 1907 session of the Legislature, by the same obedient majority that had passed it twelve months before. They were doubtless moved to do this by the declaration of the Liberal platform in favor of restoring the municipal franchise to married women.

THE LIBERAL PLATFORM

**Resolutions Adopted by the Liberals
of Manitoba in Convention, March
27 and 28, 1906.**

Finances of the Province.

That, whereas the expenditure of this Province in 1905 was more than double that of 1898, this convention regards the increase as excessive and disproportionate to the revenue resources of the Province, and believes that the application of business methods would result in better administration of the public service at greatly reduced cost.

Provincial Lands.

That the policy of selling tracts of land to speculators by private sale is to be condemned as injurious to the public interest; that arable land be sold only to actual settlers at reasonable prices, and under conditions imposing settlement duties; and that all other lands be disposed of by public competition.

Publicity.

We regard a policy of publicity in connection with the Government's business transactions as desirable, and declare in favor of the publication in the issue of the Manitoba Gazette next after the event of the details of all such transactions as the sale of public lands, letting of contracts, the sale of debentures, with such further information as is necessary to inform the taxpayers as to the state and progress of public business.

Temperance.

That the Liberal party place on record its cordial sympathy with the temperance movement as a moral reform, and

Pledges itself, if returned to power, rigidly to enforce the provisions of the law with regard to the liquor traffic, and so to amend the present license act as to make the following provisions effective:

The enactment or repeal of local option by-laws upon the majority of the votes cast by the resident electors of cities, towns, villages and rural municipalities.

The restoration of the municipal franchise to married women who have the necessary property qualifications.

The appointment of license commissioners and inspectors who are in hearty sympathy with the enforcement of all provisions of the law.

That licenses shall be issued once a year, and once a year only, upon application filed on or before a fixed time.

On a petition of 25 per cent. of the resident electors, local option must be submitted to municipal council.

The electors of municipalities shall have the power, not only to pass local option by-laws, but also to limit or reduce the number of licenses in the municipality; And that any municipal council must submit the question to a vote on the petition of 25 per cent. of the resident electors.

Education.

That the Liberal party pledges itself, if returned to power, to a forward policy in the matter of education. Education has suffered, and is suffering grave disadvantages in this Province from its subordination to another department, and should be placed in charge of a minister of education.

Extension of Province.

That this convention is of the opinion that in order that Manitoba may take her rightful place in confederation it is essential that the area of the Province be increased to include that part of the present territory of Keewatin lying between the northern boundary of Manitoba and the Hudson Bay, and that our financial arrangements with Ottawa should be placed on the same basis as those of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Hudson Bay Railway.

That in view of the importance to Western Canada of the early construction of the Hudson Bay railway, the Dominion Government, in the opinion of this convention, should make this work a national undertaking and insure its early completion under conditions which would make the road an open railway highway to the sea for all time.

Agriculture.

That agriculture being the paramount industry of Manitoba, this convention is of the opinion that its importance warrants the creation (or allotment) of a separate portfolio to agriculture, as is the case in the other provinces, in order that the various matters connected with agriculture, such as fat stock shows, travelling dairies, agricultural colleges, grants to fairs, live stock and grain growers' associations, exhibitions, agricultural education in the schools, and legislation pertaining solely to technical agriculture, e. g., noxious weeds, etc., may be properly and intelligently dealt with. And, further, that this convention views with regret the indifference shown by the present Government to advanced work in agriculture by its indifference towards such great movements as the seed grain special and seed fairs.

Commercial Intelligence Branch.

That as Manitoba is pre-eminently a farming province the encouragement of agriculture in all its branches should be the first duty of the Government, and that its agricultural department should include a commercial intelligence branch.

Good Roads.

That inasmuch as the prosperity of the Province depends in large measure upon the existence of good roads the Government should have a definite

policy whereby it can co-operate with the municipalities in building a first-class system of main thoroughfares.

Sharing Taxes With Municipalities.

That a reasonable proportion of the revenue received from the taxation of railway companies be distributed on some equitable plan of distribution, to the municipalities.

Conserving Trust Funds.

That all receipts of principal from M. & N. W. and H. B. land sales, be set aside for payment of the bonds maturing in 1910.

Voters' Lists.

That the Election Act should provide that voters' lists should be prepared specially for each election, whether a general or a bye-election, and only then; that the lists should be based on a list of resident ratepayers prepared by the municipal authorities, supplemented by personal registration under conditions giving ample facilities for the purpose.

Railway Bond Guarantees.

That this convention expresses its emphatic disapproval of the unwise wholesale guaranteeing of railway bonds.

Public Ownership.

That the public should control all public utilities, such as waterworks, lighting, and telephone systems and that in granting franchises and charters for such the right of their ultimate ownership by the people should be provided for.

Fair Wages and Factories Act.

That a fair wage clause be inserted in all contracts awarded by the Provincial Government, and that the provision for the same be made in the case of contracts upon works subsidized by the Government:

That the Factories Act be rigidly enforced:

That amendments be made to the Workingmen's Compensation Act extending the remedies and facilitating trials under the act.

Combines.

That it is the duty of the Crown to subject all alleged combines and associations in restraint of trade to the most searching investigation; and to prosecute and punish all breaches of the law in this respect.

Administration of Justice.

That the administration of justice should be impartial and non-political, thereby commanding the respect and confidence of the people in contrast with the persistent and determined prostitution of the machinery of justice to partisan ends, which has been the practice of the present administration.

Immigration and Colonization Policy.

That the prosperity of the Province could be greatly enhanced by a vigorous publicity, immigration and colonization policy, by which settlers would be secured for Manitoba.

A Revenue Tariff.

That the Liberals of Manitoba in convention assembled affirm their adherence to the traditional Liberal policy; that the rate of customs taxation should be based solely on the revenue requirements of the country; and declare it to be their intention resolutely to oppose any proposal, from whatever source, to increase the tariff, as being prejudicial to the interests of the Dominion as a whole;

And, further, are of the opinion that in the forthcoming revision of the tariff, it is desirable that the tendency of the changes should be towards lower duties, particularly on lumber, machinery, fruit, and clothing, which are necessities of the western farmers, whose prosperity ensures the prosperity of the manufacturing industries; and the preference of 33 1-3 per cent. on importations from Great Britain and her colonies should be maintained in its entirety.

Approval of Dominion Government Policy.

This convention of Manitoba Liberals desires to place on record its approval of the ten years of capable and progressive administration given the Dominion by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues; and in particular commends them for their energetic and statesmanlike immigration and transportation policy which has been a main factor in the great development of Western Canada; and this convention feels confident that the continuance of this policy of peopling the West with desirable settlers and securing the construction of necessary main railway highways will be of lasting benefit to the whole Dominion.

Telephones.

Resolution adopted by the Manitoba Liberal Executive Dec. 27, 1906:

"The Liberal party declares emphatically in favor of complete Government ownership and operation of a telephone system in this Province, believing this to be the only practical solution of the question of coping with the existing monopoly, and, if the party is successful in carrying the country, we undertake to proceed with the installation of such a system as soon as the necessary legislation can be passed and the present Government's Acts repealed, so as to relieve the municipalities of the cost and trouble of installing their systems."

The Government and Elevators.

From an interview with Edward Brown published in the Free Press, Jan. 14, 1907.—"In so far as the elevator monopoly is concerned, in my judgment the time is fast approaching when in view of the tremendous importance of the grain trade, and in order to insure that the farmer will get the full benefit of his industry, it may become imperative that storage elevators in this Province should be owned and operated by the

Government, particularly for the benefit and accommodation of the farmers instead of for the purpose of gain or profit.

"I am not prepared to commit the Liberal party to an undertaking so vast where such large interests are at stake, without first making the matter the subject of the fullest and most searching enquiry. I do not think, however, that the credit of the Province could be pledged for a better purpose or one that would more materially increase our prosperity or strengthen our credit abroad, than for providing relief along these lines to the farmers of the Province.

"I am prepared to-day to go this far, that is to say: If our party is returned to power, we will not only undertake to construct a Government elevator at any point where it can be shown that injustice is being meted out to the farmers, but further that we will make the whole matter the subject of an enquiry with a view to establishing a system of Government-owned elevators throughout the Province. This would not, of course, entail the Province going into the grain business."

CONSERVATIVE PLATFORM OF 1899

(Adopted in Convention, July, 1899.)

I.

"That the alarming condition of the finances of the Province demands the introduction of such economical methods of administration as will re-establish the equilibrium between receipts and expenditures."

This resolution was moved by Mr. Roblin, who last year, as premier, spent \$1,854,579 in contrast with a Liberal expenditure of \$837,887 in 1898 and \$942,361 in 1899.

II.

"That the number of Cabinet Ministers be reduced to three, and that two Ministers without portfolio be added to the Cabinet for the purpose of consultation."

Moved by Dr. McFadden, of the present ministry, which numbers five paid members. This pledge was lived up to for one year only.

III.

"That the indemnity of members be reduced to four hundred dollars (\$400)."

The sessional indemnity was \$700 in 1900, the first year of Conservative rule; \$400 a year until 1905, when it went back to the Greenway figure of \$500. In 1906 it was \$700, and in 1907 \$500.

IV.

"That the present iniquitous franchise law be repealed, and that an equitable act, based on the principle of manhood suffrage, and one man one vote, be enacted."

V.

"That the Allen Labor Act be strictly enforced."

The Province has nothing to do with the enforcement of the Allen Labor act.

VI.

"The encouragement of an immigration policy that will secure to the Province her just proportion of a desirable class of European immigrants, as well as those from the older provinces of Canada and the United States, but regret the wholesale importation of undesirable immigrants from Southern Europe."

VII.

That the affairs of the Province be administered on ordinary business principles, without regard to political considerations, especially in so far as our educational system is concerned, which should be absolutely freed from any party politics by the establishment of an independent Board of Education."

The promised "Independent Board of Education" has never made its appearance.

VIII.

"That the Province have complete control of the school lands and the proceeds of the sale of all lands that have been sold or will be sold in the future to be used only for the purposes of supplementing the ordinary school grant as given from year to year."

Though the Roblin Government, during its last five years of office received from the school funds at Ottawa \$566,822, as against \$78,182 received by the Liberals during their last five years of office, the ordinary school grant has not been "supplemented" by a single

cent. The school grant remains where it was placed by the Liberal Government—at \$130 per year.

IX.

"That the proper administration of justice, including the appointment of justices of the peace, commissioners in B. R., and other officers of justice, be from representative men independent of politics."

The present Government has dismissed police magistrates at Winnipeg, Carberry, Neepawa, for political reasons; nearly all the county court clerks appointed by the Liberals; and registrars and officials of the Land Titles offices. Moreover, the J. P.'s who held office under the Greenway Government were dismissed in a body, and the new J. P.'s appointed were, with but few exceptions, supporters of the present Government.

X.

"That the Province, providing its revenue is found sufficient for the purpose, establish and maintain an agricultural college, also a technical school, at which mechanics and others may receive a practical training."

The "technical school" has not yet made its appearance.

XI.

"The adoption of the principle of government ownership of railways, in so far as the circumstances of the Province will admit, and the adoption of the principle that no bonus should be granted to any railway company which does not give the Government of the Province the control of rates over line bonused, together with the option of purchase."

XII.

"That the demand be made for the transfer of all Crown lands within the boundaries of Manitoba to the Province."

XIII.

"That aid be granted to municipalities by way of guarantee of interest upon debentures when required."

XIV.

"Equal rights to all."

XV.

"That an act be passed providing for compensation for injuries received by workmen in their usual employment."

Such a law has been on the statute book since 1893.

XVI.

"That the boundaries of the Province be extended northward to Hudson's Bay."

XVII.

"That the Province assume the control and administration of the fisheries of the Province."

XVIII.

"That a line of railway be constructed to Hudson's Bay."

XIX.

"That a measure be adopted to give effect to the will of the people regarding Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, which measure should go as far in the direction of prohibition as the powers of the Province will allow."

NOTABLE UTTERANCES OF MR. R. P. ROBLIN

"I AM NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL I SAY, SPEAKING POLITICALLY."—Statement made on oath by Mr. Roblin, under cross-examination, in the presence of a crowded court room in Winnipeg, November 11, 1890.

"The wives and mothers of Manitoba ought to thank Heaven—yes, devoutly thank Heaven—that there is now in power in this Province a Government which has given proof of the SINCERITY OF ITS PROHIBITION PLEDGE TO THE ELECTORS by passing the Liquor Act."—Speech at Victoria Hall, Carman, October 19, 1900, in support of Mr. Colin H. Campbell's re-election as Attorney-General.

"THE RAILWAY QUESTION IN MANITOBA IS SOLVED."—Speech at Neepawa, January 14, 1901.

"Where is the demand for the construction of this road (the Grand Trunk Pacific)? I fail to find it anywhere." Manitoba to-day needed no mere railways for the average distance from the farmer to the railway in Manitoba was but five miles."—Interview in the Toronto News, Aug. 10, 1903, much quoted by opponents of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

"I am glad to say that for the first time in my 26 years' experience in Manitoba there is no suggestion that could be made to either of the railway companies that would improve the conditions. I can say without egotism that this pleasing result is due to the railway policy of the Provincial Government of which I am the Premier."—Interview in Montreal Star, Oct. 30, 1903.

"I claim that in the bill before the House (the Canadian Northern Bill) we have all the practical benefits of Government ownership without the disadvantage of having to operate the road."—Speech in Legislature, March 6, 1901.

"As to the operation of the railways the Canadian Northern was under a Dominion charter; and they had no more to do with the control of it than the member for Birtle."—Speech in Legislature, Jan. 8, 1907.

"It is no prohibition bill whatever: it is simply a bill providing for free whiskey."—Letter to W. R. Mulock, Jan. 21, 1902. "I never said that the Liquor Act meant free whiskey."—Speech at Winnipeg theatre, March 10, 1902.

"The unfairness of Britain in not conceding commercial advantages to Canada."—Speech at Borden banquet, Winnipeg, October 20, 1902.

"A tariff similar to that of the United States should be adopted for the Dominion,.....In any case where the United States placed an import duty on anything, Canada should reciprocate and in turn place an equivalent import duty.....There could be no longer be any doubt that the time had come when the Federal Government SHOULD DO AWAY WITH ANY PREFERENCE.....He was glad to speak in Montreal, the heart of the manufacturing industry of Canada. He knew they were not indifferent to the success of the Great West. The West was ready to do its share toward helping to build up the industries of Canada. THE PEOPLE OF MANITOBA WERE PROTECTIONISTS, they were READY TO PAY A LITTLE MORE, if necessary, in order to build up the industries of Montreal, of Sherbrooke, of Three Rivers, of London, of Terentoto."—Speech at the Monk banquet in Montreal, January 28, 1903.—Star report.

"I was out all day yesterday in the wheat fields. Farmers in the west do not yet know how badly they are damaged. Wait for a couple of months, when threshing is on. Wheat at present prices will look cheap before New Year's."—Celebrated telegram of Sept. 7, 1904, to Chicago grain men to influence the market.

"He had never bought an acre of land from the C. N. R. in his life."—At Belisvain, Dec. 28, 1906.

"We cannot control a Dominion chartered railway," (the C. N. R.)—In the Legislature, Jan. 7, 1907.

THE TELEPHONE QUESTION

The Union of Manitoba Municipalities at its meeting in 1904 declared unanimously for the public ownership of telephones; and in the 1905 meeting held at Brandon the following resolution was passed:

"That the Manitoba Union of Municipalities shall be pleased to co-operate with the Provincial Government in the establishment of a telephone system throughout the Province, the trunk lines of which shall be constructed and operated by the Government upon terms satisfactory to the municipalities, and that a committee composed of Mayor Sharpe, of Winnipeg; Ald. Coldwell, of Brandon; Ald. Harvey, of Dauphin, and Reeve Cochran, of Blanchard, be appointed to deal with the matter; and that powers of expropriation be obtained, granted or exercised by and to the Government of Manitoba and the municipalities, if deemed advisable."

At the 1906 session of the Legislature the Roblin Government took up the telephone question. In place of following the suggestion of the Municipal Union and formulating a plan, in consultation with the Union, thus keeping the matter out of politics, the Government conceived that it would be politically advantageous to capture the movement and add it to the Government's assets.

The Municipal Union Ignored.

They hastily concocted a telephone plan which they put upon the statute book, without consulting the special committee appointed by the Municipal Union to assist in the drafting of such a measure.

Features of the 1906 Legislation.

The outstanding features of the telephone legislation were these:

Every municipality must take a vote of the property owners at the next municipal election upon the question "Shall this municipality own and operate its own telephones?" A sixty per cent. vote in the affirmative authorized the Municipal Council at any future time to issue debentures for the installation of a municipal telephone system "without any further submission of any by-law for the assent of the electors."

The Provincial Government was authorized to build long distance lines throughout the Province; and it could also build the local exchanges in Winnipeg, Portage la Prairie and Brandon, if requested to do so by the councils of those places.

Imported Telephone Speakers.

The Government took power to guarantee the telephone debentures of any municipality at its discretion.

The by-law was submitted on the municipalities at the December elections; and to ensure its passage the Government organized a campaign in its behalf. For the month before the voting the Province was overrun with imported speakers. Among the paid speakers were J. B. Waro, of Grand Rapids, who got \$1,250 for a month's work; Joshua Dyko, of Fort William, who got \$450; C. B. Cheadle, of Iowa, \$250; A. Hoover, of Ontario, \$175; A. F. Demers, \$340; N. F. Wing, of Minneapolis, \$350. In all \$3,252 was paid for speakers, together with travelling and hotel expenses. This does not include the salary and expenses of F. Dagger, the Government telephone "expert."

Defeated in Sixty-Eight Municipalities.

Out of 124 municipalities which voted on the by-law 68 rejected it and 56 supported it. The chief weakness in the Government's scheme was that, under the provisions governing the issuing of the debentures, the municipality as a whole was responsible. Mr. Dagger and the other paid speakers were instructed to deny this, and to claim that only the telephone users would be liable; and Mr. Roblin and Mr. Campbell supported this by interviews in the press and public utterances. The law, however, was explicit on the point.

Strong objection was also taken to the provision enabling the Government to build local exchanges in Winnipeg, Brandon and Portage la Prairie only.

The Liberal Position Defined.

During the campaign the Liberal party took no position one way or the other on the telephone, but after the vote had been taken Edward Brown, the Liberal leader, made a public statement. Asked why the Liberals had not disclosed their policy before the plebiscite, he said:

"Because we were most anxious not to introduce politics into municipal matters. Had our policy been announced before the plebiscite it would have created a sharp political division, and instead of the Government scheme being defeated in 72 municipalities, while the vote over the whole Province showed a slight majority in the affirmative (which may be taken as indicating that not even the pernicious legislation of the Government was able to defeat entirely the sentiment in favor of public ownership), the result would have been that the country would have defeated the plebiscite entirely by a large majority voting against municipal ownership.

"While that would have suited the Liberal policy from a party point of view, we had higher interests in mind. It would have done the Province harm had it gone forth to the world that Manitoba had rejected public ownership principles. It would have raised keen party differences in the municipal contests, and would have left the real sentiment of the people in greater doubt than it is to-day.

"Under these circumstances the Liberal party as supporters of public ownership decided to stand aside until after

the problem so as not to still further confuse the issue in the minds of the electors. For this reason we took no part in the matter. We left our supporters to do as they pleased. I myself at almost every meeting I have spoken at have been careful to say that the Liberal party would be equally well satisfied whichever way the vote went, but that we thought it would be a pity if the Province voted in a way which would lead outsiders to suppose that we were opposed to public ownership. At Melita I took a stand that a vote in the affirmative would be regarded as an endorsement of the Liberal party. I did this because at Melita I definitely stated what our policy was. The conditions there were peculiar. Our candidate had been grossly misrepresented, and I thought it wise to state for the benefit of the Melita people especially what our policy was. The Telegram reported my speech on Monday, Dec. 3, and so in their wild assertions and demands for my policy at subsequent dates they were ignoring the very plain declaration reported in their own columns.

"At Neepawa again I advised the people of Beautiful Plains to vote 'Yes,' if by so doing they merely meant to endorse the principle of public ownership, but I showed them very clearly to what extent they would be committed by the Government by such a vote, and I was not surprised to find that not even a desire to support the principle induced them to give a vote which would have been interpreted as support of the Government scheme.

"The Liberal party were in a most difficult position on this question. Which ever way we acted we were liable to be misunderstood, and the Government had cleverly put up a trick to obtain a vote of confidence under false pretences. We were opposed to the Government scheme on close examination of its defects, but to come out and advise the people to vote 'No' on the abstract question submitted would have placed us in a false light, and misinterpreted our sentiments, besides bringing politics into the municipal elections. We could not consistently advise the voters to vote in the affirmative because a victory would have been claimed by the Government for their scheme which we disapproved of, besides which we were not on trial. It was the Government scheme, and its authors who were on trial, and cleverly as they tried to confuse the issue, the very indecisive character of the vote is a condemnation of them and their scheme. It also leaves the way clear for our policy to be announced.

Complete Government Ownership.

"The Liberal party declares emphatically in favor of complete Government ownership and operation of a telephone system in this Province, believing this to be the only practical solution of the question of coping with the existing monopoly, and if the party is successful in carrying the country, we undertake to proceed with the installation of

such a system as soon as the necessary legislation can be passed, and the present Government's acts repealed, so, as to relieve the municipalities of the cost and trouble of installing their own systems.

"Of course there would be nothing in the proposed legislation to prohibit any municipality from establishing its own system if it preferred doing so. We believe that a complete system of Government 'phones to be installed and operated by a central independent commission a much stronger and more economical scheme than if the long distance lines were under Government management, and a great many separate systems under municipal management; and in view of the competition to be met it is essential to the successful carrying out of the undertaking that the strongest possible position should be occupied by the Province.

"We would conduct the system on strictly business principles, and there would be such reductions of price as the receipts would warrant without making any general charge on the revenue of the Province, bearing in mind the primary object of the undertaking, namely, the rendering of a satisfactory service, and the bringing of the telephone into common use for all classes by furnishing the service at cost.

"We concede that a dual system is not desirable, but having regard to the future it is of the greatest importance that this utility should be owned by the people, and even if the keenest competition had to be met for a number of years undoubtedly the Province would eventually win out."

"Have you anything to say in reply to Mr. Roblin's charges against you as to your alleged interest in a telephone charter granted by the Dominion Government?"

"I think it is hardly necessary," said Mr. Brown, "in view of the above statement, coupled with the speeches I have made throughout the country since the Liberal platform of last March declared in favor of public ownership of telephones."

Government Recasts Its Scheme.

The result of the voting on the plebiscite and the declaration of the Liberal policy compelled the Government at the recent session of the House to recast its entire scheme. The net result of the modifications is to bring it much nearer the Liberal policy.

The new legislation provides that any municipality in which the by-law carried can request the Government to build the system; or if the municipality takes no action at all the Government can construct and operate such a system.

Where the by-law was defeated provision is made for its resubmission. If on the second trial it carries the municipality can either build its own system or turn the work over to the Government; while if the by-law is defeated the Government has the power to go ahead and build anyway.

The design of the legislation is to encourage the municipalities to step aside and allow the Government to build both the long distance lines and local exchanges. In other words the Government is trying by roundabout methods to reach the same position as that occupied by the Liberal party.

The Telephone Vote.

Subjoined are the official returns of the vote on the telephone by-law at the municipal elections. Brandon is marked in this list as "carried." This is, however, a disputable point, as it is contended that, under the Municipal Act, too small a percentage of the entire vote was cast to validate the by-law:

| | Yes. | No. | Car-ried. | De-f'ed. |
|---------------------|------|-----|-----------|----------|
| Albert.. | 11 | 50 | | 1 |
| Archib.. | 33 | 4 | 1 | |
| Argyle.. | 111 | 93 | | 1 |
| Arthur.. | 83 | 50 | 1 | |
| Assinibola.. .. | 55 | 4 | 1 | |
| Birtle Town.. .. | 20 | 2 | 1 | |
| Birtle.. | 197 | 56 | 1 | |
| Blanshard.. .. | 92 | 39 | 1 | |
| Bolssevain.. .. | 67 | 39 | 1 | |
| Boulton.. | Nil. | 17 | | 1 |
| Brandon City.. .. | 312 | 85 | 1 | |
| Brenda.. | 161 | 35 | 1 | |
| Brokenhead.. .. | 20 | 115 | | 1 |
| Cameron.. | 131 | 79 | 1 | |
| Carberry.. | 33 | 15 | 1 | |
| Carman.. | 56 | 23 | 1 | |
| Clanwilliam.. .. | 48 | 30 | 1 | |
| Cornwallis.. .. | 39 | 8 | 1 | |
| Cyprese (North).. | 98 | 63 | 1 | |
| Cypress (South).. | 50 | 112 | | 1 |
| Daly.. | 81 | 111 | | 1 |
| Dauphin.. | 136 | 193 | | 1 |
| Dauphin Town.. .. | 105 | 65 | 1 | |
| Deloraine.. | 51 | 41 | | 1 |
| De Salaberry.. .. | 53 | 135 | | 1 |
| Dufferin.. | 296 | 317 | | 1 |
| Edward.. | 131 | 62 | 1 | |
| Ellice.. | 22 | 7 | 1 | |
| Elkhorn.. | 42 | 13 | 1 | |
| Elton.. | 152 | 124 | | 1 |
| Emerson Town.... | 47 | 23 | 1 | |
| Ethelbert.. | 16 | 135 | | 1 |
| Franklin.. | 229 | 88 | 1 | |
| Gilbert Plains.. .. | 132 | 216 | | 1 |
| Gilbert Village.... | 29 | 3 | 1 | |
| Gimli..... | 11 | 28 | | 1 |
| Gladstone.. | 29 | 16 | 1 | |
| Glenwood.. | 46 | 28 | 1 | |
| Gretna Village.. .. | 27 | 56 | | 1 |
| Grandview.. | 95 | 61 | 1 | |
| Grandview Village | 42 | 15 | 1 | |
| Grey.. | 44 | 63 | | 1 |
| Hamiota.. | 186 | 80 | 1 | |
| Hanover.. | Nil. | 158 | | 1 |
| Harrison.. | 30 | 36 | | 1 |
| Hartney.. | 40 | 11 | 1 | |
| Kildonan.. | 99 | 20 | 1 | |
| Killarney.. | 70 | 44 | 1 | |
| La Broquerie.. .. | 40 | 67 | | 1 |
| Langford.. | 72 | 125 | | 1 |
| Lansdowne.. .. | 91 | 188 | | 1 |
| Lorne.. | 206 | 81 | 1 | |
| Loulse..... | 44 | 100 | | 1 |
| Macdonald.. | 91 | 50 | 1 | |
| Manitou.. | 37 | 24 | 1 | |
| Melita.. | 33 | 15 | 1 | |
| Minnedoea.. .. | 43 | 37 | | 1 |
| Miniota.. | 135 | 71 | 1 | |
| Minitonas.. | 46 | 75 | | 1 |
| Minto.. | 85 | 63 | 1 | |
| Montcalm.. | 75 | 208 | | 1 |
| Morden.. | 49 | 58 | | 1 |
| Morris..... | 27 | 117 | | 1 |
| Morris Town.. .. | 26 | 16 | 1 | |
| Morton.. | 129 | 27 | 1 | |
| Mossy River.. | 33 | 117 | | 1 |
| Norfolk (North).. | 200 | 275 | | 1 |
| Norfolk (South).. | 221 | 139 | 1 | |

| | Yes. | No. | Car-ried. | De-ferred. |
|------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Oakland.. .. . | 101 | 82 | | 1 |
| Ochre River.. .. . | 60 | 151 | | 1 |
| Odanah.. .. . | 58 | 35 | 1 | |
| Pembina.. .. . | 101 | 165 | | 1 |
| Pilot Mound.. .. . | 40 | 89 | | 1 |
| Pipestone.. .. . | 110 | 46 | 1 | |
| Plum Coulee.. .. . | 9 | 18 | | 1 |
| Portage la Prairie | 343 | 284 | | 1 |
| P. la P. Town.. .. . | 201 | 185 | | 1 |
| Rosedale.. .. . | 88 | 243 | | 1 |
| Rapid City.. .. . | 20 | 88 | | 1 |
| Rhineland.. .. . | 45 | 324 | | 1 |
| Ritchot.. .. . | 78 | 186 | | 1 |
| Riverside.. .. . | 55 | 58 | | 1 |
| Roblin.. .. . | 178 | 113 | 1 | |
| Rockwood.. .. . | 80 | 144 | | 1 |
| Rossburn.. .. . | 63 | 124 | | 1 |
| Rosser.. .. . | 38 | 22 | 1 | |
| Russell.. .. . | 43 | 45 | | 1 |
| Saskatchewan.. .. . | 38 | 95 | | 1 |
| Solkirk.. .. . | 136 | 66 | 1 | |
| Sheal Lake.. .. . | 28 | 109 | | 1 |
| Sholl River.. .. . | 148 | 221 | | 1 |
| Sifton.. .. . | 121 | 71 | 1 | |
| Silver Creek.. .. . | 28 | 142 | | 1 |
| Souris.. .. . | 124 | 37 | 1 | |
| Springfield.. .. . | 98 | 140 | | 1 |
| Stanley.. .. . | 78 | 237 | | 1 |
| Strathclair.. .. . | 90 | 105 | | 1 |
| Stuartburn.. .. . | 10 | 105 | | 1 |
| St. Andrews.. .. . | 75 | 137 | | 1 |
| St. Boniface.. .. . | 610 | 107 | 1 | |
| St. Clements.. .. . | 19 | 110 | | 1 |
| St. Fr. Xavier.. .. . | 58 | 126 | | 1 |
| St. Laurent.. .. . | 29 | 54 | | 1 |
| St. Paul Parish.. .. . | 39 | 10 | 1 | |
| St. Rose.. .. . | 45 | 150 | | 1 |
| St. Vital.. .. . | 16 | 18 | | 1 |
| Strathcona.. .. . | 37 | 46 | | 1 |
| Stonewall.. .. . | 35 | 30 | | 1 |
| Swan River.. .. . | 127 | 159 | | 1 |
| Tache.. .. . | 163 | 284 | | 1 |
| Turtle Mountain.. .. . | 140 | 82 | 1 | |
| Victoria.. .. . | 116 | 24 | 1 | |
| Virden.. .. . | 90 | 35 | 1 | |
| Wallace.. .. . | 123 | 67 | 1 | |
| Westbourne.. .. . | 206 | 269 | | 1 |
| Whitehead.. .. . | 80 | 8 | 1 | |
| Whitemouth.. .. . | 24 | 67 | | 1 |
| Whitewater.. .. . | 132 | 63 | 1 | |
| Winchester.. .. . | 32 | 41 | | 1 |
| Winkler Village.. .. . | 21 | 54 | | 1 |
| Winnipeg.. .. . | 2,984 | 981 | 1 | |
| Woodworth.. .. . | 184 | 69 | 1 | |
| Woodlands.. .. . | 31 | 86 | | 1 |
| | <u>13,688</u> | <u>11,569</u> | <u>55</u> | <u>67</u> |

A Check for the Government.

The Government announced that all municipalities, where there had been an affirmative vote must decide by April 1 what they were going to do to leave the road free for the Government; but they struck a snag in the city of Winnipeg which declined to decide a question of such moment on such short notice; and on Feb. 11 the following resolution was passed by the city council asking the Government to take no action without the full concurrence of the city:

"In view of the fact that the council has not had opportunity to thoroughly consider the question of construction of a system of telephones for the city, or the question of the local Government taking up the construction of such a system, and in view of the fact of the desirability that ample time should be given for the council to thoroughly consider and deal with the question as it might deem best, the board recommends that the council respectfully but urgently, request that no decision should be arrived at by the Government or Legislature without the thorough concurrence of the city."

Hypocrisy of the Government Exposed.

The great point at issue in the telephone campaign was that every taxpayer in a municipality is liable for any deficit in the working of municipal phones. The man who buys debentures does not care whether the rates charged cover the cost or not, because the municipality as a whole is liable for such debentures. The government strenuously denied this fact, both the premier and the attorney-general being interviewed and issuing special statements to the effect that no liability would fall on anyone except the users of the phones. When the bill to amend the Telephone Act was read a third time on Tuesday, Feb. 12th, of the session just closed (1907) the opposition moved to insert in the clause dealing with rates (clause 1, of section 10 line 2) to add words showing that such rates charged to the users of 'phones and the government guarantee should be the sole security for the telephone debentures issued by the municipality. This would have relieved municipal taxpayers of any liability for telephone debentures, but the government refused the amendment, and it was voted down by 16 votes to 6.

No member of the government replied to Mr. Horace Chevrier who moved the amendment.

INTERFERENCE WITH COURTS BY ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

In November, 1906, a box of moccasins valued at about \$70 consigned to Theo. Wachna, of Stuartburn, was shipped from Winnipeg to Dominion City, which is the nearest C. P. R. point to Stuartburn. Wachna never received these goods and complained of their non-arrival to the C. P. R. freight authorities in Winnipeg. The railway company made investigations and found that the goods had been duly delivered at Dominion City. No trace of the box or its contents could, however, be found till the latter part of December, when Mrs. Krivel, who runs a general store at that point, was charged before Police Magistrate Jas. Scott with having received the goods in error, and with having appropriated them. The magistrate after hearing the evidence, gave judgment that Mrs. Krivel was to make restitution of the goods or part the value of the same, and he also committed her to the Winnipeg jail for a period of thirty days.

The magistrate issued a warrant of commitment, which was placed in the hands of Provincial Constable Simpson, who took the prisoner to Winnipeg. A brother of the prisoner, I. Muldoon, of Stuartburn, who is Dr. McFadden's political agent in that district, accompanied the party to the city, and when they arrived, the constable, under instructions from some unidentified party, took the prisoner, not to the jail, but to the home of her sister in Winnipeg. Dr. McFadden was then appealed to, and he in turn consulted with Colin H. Campbell, the Attorney-General. The result of this intervention was the issuing of instructions to the constable, presumably by the Attorney-General, to give the prisoner her liberty, and she returned to Dominion City the same day.

These facts, although published at the time by the press, have never been replied to, in any way, by the Attorney-General.

INDEX.

| | Page. |
|--|-------|
| AGRICULTURE— | |
| Bad Location of Agricultural College.... | 42 |
| Agricultural Reports Suppressed..... | 43 |
| Institutes Abandoned | 43 |
| Live Stock Sales Not Aided..... | 44 |
| Seed Special Ignored | 44 |
| New Deputy Minister | 45 |
| Plank in Liberal Platform | 48 |
| BOUNDARY QUESTION— | |
| Never a Political Issue | 40 |
| Liberal Policy | 41 |
| Edward Brown's Statement | 41 |
| BROWN, ED.—Statements by— | |
| Elevators and the Government | 51 |
| Extension Manitoba Boundaries | 41 |
| Telephones | 58 |
| CAMPBELL, C. H.— | |
| Pritchard Incident | 23 |
| Statement on Liquor Act | 32 |
| Referendum Irregularities | 73 |
| Lac du Bonnet Telegram | 39 |
| Dominion City Case | 63 |
| COMBINES— | |
| Plank in Liberal Platform..... | 49 |
| CONSERVATIVE PLATFORM OF 1888.... | 52 |
| EDUCATION— | |
| Plank in Liberal Platform | 48 |
| ELEVATORS— | |
| Statement by Ed. Brown | 51 |
| FAIR WAGES— | |
| Plank in Liberal Platform | 49 |
| FINANCE— | |
| Liberal Revenue for 7 years..... | 9 |
| Roblin Revenue for 7 years..... | 10 |
| Increased Receipts from Ottawa..... | 10 |
| Increased Land Titles Fees | 10 |
| Provincial Lands Receipts | 11 |
| 66 p.c. of Provincial Lands Sold..... | 11 |
| Actual Cash Surplus | 12 |
| Capital Outlay on Buildings | 12 |
| Grants to the People | 12 |
| Educational Grants Compared | 18 |
| Cost of Running the Machine..... | 13 |
| Liberal Plank | 47 |
| HUDSON'S BAY RAILWAY— | |
| Plank in Liberal Platform | 43 |
| H.B. LANDS— | |
| Province Secures Right to Land | 26 |
| Roblin's Excuse for Non-Selection..... | 26 |
| IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION— | |
| Plank in Liberal Platform | 49 |
| JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF— | |
| Plank in Liberal Platform | 49 |
| LAC DU BONNET TELEGRAM..... | 38 |
| LAND TITLES ASSURANCE FUND..... | 29 |
| LAND TRANSACTIONS— | |
| Area Sold by Roblin | 13 |
| The Dyck Transactions | 14 |
| Ridd-Gerrie Deals | 15 |
| Brokenhead Deal | 16 |
| Richardson's Coup | 17 |
| Options or No Options | 18 |
| Contrast with Dominion Sales | 19 |
| M. and N.W. Land | 20 |
| H. B. Lands | 26 |
| LICENSE SCANDALS— | |
| McCreary Case | 34 |
| Norwood Case | 35 |
| Ross Avenue Case | 35 |
| St. Boniface Case | 36 |
| Elmwood Case | 36 |
| Methodists Condemn Government | 37 |
| LICENSE STATISTICS— | |
| Comparison of the Two Regimes..... | 39 |
| LIQUOR ACT: HISTORY OF— | |
| The Conservative Pledge | 32 |
| Judgment of Privy Council | 33 |
| The Referendum | 33 |
| Referendum Irregularities | 33 |
| MACDONALD, H. J.— | |
| Arrangement with J. McDonald..... | 1 |
| Statement on Liquor Act | 32 |

| | Page. |
|---|-------|
| M. AND N.W. LANDS— | |
| Origin of the Debt | 20 |
| Greenway's Arrangement | 20 |
| The Trust Violated | 20 |
| Receipts from these Lands | 21 |
| No Provision to Repay Debt..... | 22 |
| MARRIED WOMEN— | |
| Disfranchisement of | 45 |
| MUNICIPALITIES— | |
| Sharing Taxes, with Plank in Liberal Platform | 49 |
| PUBLICITY— | |
| Plank in Liberal Platform | 47 |
| PUBLIC OWNERSHIP— | |
| Plank in Liberal Platform | 49 |
| RAILWAYS— | |
| The J. P. McDonald Contract | 1 |
| Northern Pacific Leased to C.N.R..... | 2 |
| "Control of Rates" | 2 |
| Rates Reduced Under Greenway | 3 |
| C.N.R. Rates Reduced and Increased.... | 3 |
| Clause 13 of C.N.R. Contract | 4 |
| "No Control over C.N.R." | 5 |
| Guarantees of C.N.R. Roads | 7 |
| Contingent Liability 27 Millions | 7 |
| RAILWAY— | |
| Guarantees to Continue | 8 |
| Liberal Position on Guarantees | 49 |
| ROBLIN— | |
| Notable Utterances of | 34 |
| Deal in C.N.R. Lands | 25 |
| SCHOOLS TREATMENT OF | 30 |
| Grants not Increased | 31 |
| Ottawa Money Misused | 31 |
| TARIFF— | |
| Plank in Liberal Platform | 50 |
| TELEPHONES— | |
| Plank in Liberal Platform | 50 |
| Brown's Statement | 58 |
| Government's Original Scheme | 58 |
| The Scheme Modified | 59 |
| Details of Municipal Vote | 60 |
| Imported Speakers | 57 |
| TEMPERANCE— | |
| See "Liquor Act," "License Scandals," | |
| "Lac du Bonnet Telegram" | |
| TRUST FUNDS— | |
| Plank in Liberal Platform | 49 |
| Land Titles Fund Used | 29 |
| M. and N.W. Trust Violated | 20 |
| VOTERS' LISTS— | |
| Plank in Liberal Platform | 49 |